

THE POTENTIAL FOR INTERNAL WARFARE
IN THE UNITED STATES

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army
Command and General Staff College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

by

DANIEL D. CURTNER, MAJ, USA
B.A., Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, 1981

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas
1995

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

19950927 116

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE 2 June 1995	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis, 2 Aug 94 - 2 Jun 95	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Potential for Internal Warfare in the United States			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Major Daniel D. Curtner, U.S. Army				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Command and General Staff College ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027-6900			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER DTIC SELECTED SEP 29 1995 F	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE A	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) Drawing upon the writings of social theorists, expositions on American society, public law, and military doctrine, this study examines the potential for internal warfare in the United States. It also addresses the potential for domestic conflict and limited forms of insurgency. The role of active military forces in countering these potential threats to internal security is discussed as well as the adequacy of public law and military doctrine. Social, political, economic, historical, and environmental characteristics of a nation serve as agents of cohesion or of conflict. The United States is increasingly divided over the social issues of race/ethnicity, religion, and crime. These three issues are exploited by some of the hostile groups which exist in the nation. These groups present a potentially violent threat to social order. Government assets and public law are adequate to deal with anticipated domestic threats. Military doctrine, however, lacks the connection between military operations in urban terrain and domestic civil disturbance. The potential nature of modern American social conflict is more organized and violent than that which our military doctrine addresses. This study concludes that internal warfare is not likely to occur, but increased social conflict and insurgency are on the horizon.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Internal Warfare, Insurgency, Domestic Conflict			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 112	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Unlimited	

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING SF 298

The Report Documentation Page (RDP) is used in announcing and cataloging reports. It is important that this information be consistent with the rest of the report, particularly the cover and title page. Instructions for filling in each block of the form follow. It is important to *stay within the lines* to meet optical scanning requirements.

Block 1. Agency Use Only (Leave blank).

Block 2. Report Date. Full publication date including day, month, and year, if available (e.g. 1 Jan 88). Must cite at least the year.

Block 3. Type of Report and Dates Covered. State whether report is interim, final, etc. If applicable, enter inclusive report dates (e.g. 10 Jun 87 - 30 Jun 88).

Block 4. Title and Subtitle. A title is taken from the part of the report that provides the most meaningful and complete information. When a report is prepared in more than one volume, repeat the primary title, add volume number, and include subtitle for the specific volume. On classified documents enter the title classification in parentheses.

Block 5. Funding Numbers. To include contract and grant numbers; may include program element number(s), project number(s), task number(s), and work unit number(s). Use the following labels:

C - Contract	PR - Project
G - Grant	TA - Task
PE - Program Element	WU - Work Unit Accession No.

Block 6. Author(s). Name(s) of person(s) responsible for writing the report, performing the research, or credited with the content of the report. If editor or compiler, this should follow the name(s).

Block 7. Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 8. Performing Organization Report Number. Enter the unique alphanumeric report number(s) assigned by the organization performing the report.

Block 9. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 10. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Report Number. (If known)

Block 11. Supplementary Notes. Enter information not included elsewhere such as: Prepared in cooperation with...; Trans. of...; To be published in.... When a report is revised, include a statement whether the new report supersedes or supplements the older report.

Block 12a. Distribution/Availability Statement. Denotes public availability or limitations. Cite any availability to the public. Enter additional limitations or special markings in all capitals (e.g. NOFORN, REL, ITAR).

DOD - See DoDD 5230.24, "Distribution Statements on Technical Documents."

DOE - See authorities.

NASA - See Handbook NHB 2200.2.

NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 12b. Distribution Code.

DOD - Leave blank.

DOE - Enter DOE distribution categories from the Standard Distribution for Unclassified Scientific and Technical Reports.

NASA - Leave blank.

NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 13. Abstract. Include a brief (*Maximum 200 words*) factual summary of the most significant information contained in the report.

Block 14. Subject Terms. Keywords or phrases identifying major subjects in the report.

Block 15. Number of Pages. Enter the total number of pages.

Block 16. Price Code. Enter appropriate price code (*NTIS only*).

Blocks 17. - 19. Security Classifications. Self-explanatory. Enter U.S. Security Classification in accordance with U.S. Security Regulations (i.e., UNCLASSIFIED). If form contains classified information, stamp classification on the top and bottom of the page.

Block 20. Limitation of Abstract. This block must be completed to assign a limitation to the abstract. Enter either UL (unlimited) or SAR (same as report). An entry in this block is necessary if the abstract is to be limited. If blank, the abstract is assumed to be unlimited.

THE POTENTIAL FOR INTERNAL WARFARE
IN THE UNITED STATES

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army
Command and General Staff College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

by

DANIEL D. CURTNER, MAJ, USA
B.A., Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, 1981

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas
1995

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Accession For		
NTIS	CRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC	TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced		<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification		
By		
Distribution/		
Availability Codes		
Dist	Avail and/or Special	
A-1		

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Name of Candidate: Major Daniel D. Curtner

Thesis Title: The Potential for Internal Warfare in the United States

Approved by:

Graham H. Turbiville, Jr., Thesis Committee Chairman
Graham H. Turbiville, Jr., Ph.D.

Geoffrey B. Demarest, Member
Lieutenant Colonel Geoffrey B. Demarest, Ph.D.

William W. Mendel, Member
Colonel (Ret) William W. Mendel, M.A.

Accepted this 2nd day of June 1995 by:

Philip J. Brookes, Director, Graduate Degree
Philip J. Brookes, Ph.D. Programs

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the student author and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College or any other governmental agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

ABSTRACT

The POTENTIAL FOR INTERNAL WARFARE IN THE UNITED STATES by Major Daniel D. Curtner, USA, 106 pages.

Drawing upon the writings of social theorists, expositions on American society, public law, and military doctrine, this study examines the potential for internal warfare in the United States. It also addresses the potential for domestic conflict and limited forms of insurgency. The role of active military forces in countering these potential threats to internal security is discussed as well as the adequacy of public law and military doctrine.

Social, political, economic, historical, and environmental characteristics of a nation serve as agents of cohesion or of conflict. The United States is increasingly divided over the issues of race/ethnicity, religion, political disaffection, and crime. These issues are exploited by some of the hostile groups which exist in the nation. These groups present a potentially violent threat to social order.

Government assets and public law are adequate to deal with anticipated domestic threats. Military doctrine, however, lacks the connection between military operations in urban terrain and domestic civil disturbance. The potential nature of modern American social conflict is more organized and violent than that which U.S. military doctrine addresses.

This study concludes that internal warfare is not likely to occur, but increased social conflict and insurgency are on the horizon.

This study is dedicated to the loving memory of my wife, Peggy L. Curtner. Without her encouragement I would have never started this project, and without respect for her memory I would have never finished. Our life together was perfectly expressed by her favorite quote from scripture, "For this cause a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh, . . ."
(Eph 5:31 NAS). We will always be-one.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
APPROVAL PAGE.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
 CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. COHESION AND CONFLICT.....	10
Characteristics of National Stability.....	10
Precursors of Conflict.....	16
America Coming Unglued.....	25
Ethnic/Racial Divisions.....	26
Crime.....	30
Religious Divisions.....	32
3. HOSTILE AMERICA.....	42
Racial/Ethnic Hate Groups.....	42
Religion-Based Extremism.....	52
Criminal Gangs.....	56
Government Opposition Groups.....	58
4. GOVERNMENT TOOLS.....	64
Assets.....	64
U.S. Law.....	68
Military Doctrine.....	72
5. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	84
America--Ready for Revolt?.....	84
Internal Threat--Reality or Fantasy?.....	90
Government Forces--Ready or Not?.....	91

Conclusions.....	94
APPENDIX	
A. RESEARCH DESIGN.....	98
B. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	100
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	102
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST.....	106

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background of Armed Conflict in the United States

Throughout United States history Americans have had armed conflict within our borders ranging from localized riots to the extreme represented by the Civil War. Americans have a strong legacy of rebellion ingrained in the national psyche. In fact, the fourth and fifth paragraphs of our Declaration of Independence state that it is our right to alter or abolish a government which becomes destructive to the ends of democracy and which fails to derive its power from the consent of the governed.¹ It is an appropriate question for all Americans to determine when, if, or to what extent they will oppose government policies. At various times there have been groups which have violently opposed the United States Government. The Boston Press Gang Riots, the Stamp Act riots, and Shays Rebellion provide examples of colonial and early American civil disorders which progressed to armed conflict.² Ethnic tensions, government conscription laws, and labor disputes precipitated a number of riots in the U.S. from the middle of the nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century.³ Federal military force played a part in subduing a number of these situations. In recent times the United States has had the Weather Underground, Students for Democratic Society, and the Black Panthers of the 1960s. These groups were violently opposed to the Viet Nam War and to social

conditions which they perceived as unjust. Racial and ethnic issues have inflamed various groups and given birth to organizations like the Ku Klux Klan, American Indian Movement, and the Jewish Defense League. Interest in these groups has faded. Recent events, however, like the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms raid on the Branch Davidian Compound in Waco, Texas, the Los Angeles riots, the rise of organized drug gangs, and the murder of abortion workers in Florida and Massachusetts have rekindled interest in violent groups. Stress and social friction will not likely disappear from the American environment, and given our history of violent reaction to these stresses, one can reasonably conclude that further violence will occur. Given the fact that the United States also has a history of federal military involvement in internal conflict, prudence dictates a look at the military role in this arena.

Research Questions

The United States has weathered the storms of a variety of internal conflicts. The question of this study, however, is the potential for internal warfare within the United States. To put it in proper perspective there are several subordinate questions which this paper addresses. The first asks: What are the conditions and characteristics which describe a stable society? An understanding of social stability and what it takes for a nation to remain a cohesive whole provides a useful framework for an analysis of social disintegration. Internal warfare being the ultimate symptom of social disintegration, what are the conditions and characteristics which precede internal warfare? Social, economic, and political conditions

provide both cohesion in society and motivations for conflict. This study reviews the current status of American society to ask if any of the conditions which precede internal warfare are present. After determining the presence of these divisive conditions, it asks what are the groups which capitalize on these conditions? By surveying these groups, this paper investigates their degree of support from outside the United States. It seeks to identify the point at which direct, military involvement is required to combat internal warfare.

Definitions and Assumptions

Throughout this paper the term internal warfare appears. It represents the highest level of conflict on a continuum ranging from warfare to civil conflict. It is defined here as an organizational level of conflict which mobilizes and organizes large portions of the population. It is characterized by a level of violence, organization, and sophistication which is beyond the capability of local or state government to control. Internal warfare constitutes a direct threat to the national government and sovereignty. Forces engaged in internal warfare are capable of directly altering the territorial bounds, as well as the political, economic, and social systems of the nation. It demands active, military operations to defeat.

A transitional level between internal warfare and lesser conflicts is insurgency. An insurgency is an organized movement usually aimed at the overthrow of a constituted government through the use of subversion and armed conflict.⁴ It begins as a small, localized movement with the intent of expanding to the national level. At its initial stages it can be addressed by local or state assets. However,

as it progresses it overwhelms these and requires direct military action by federal forces. This study asserts that the nature of insurgency is changing and does not fit the traditional, Maoist/Vietnamese model of the 1960s. Insurgents may limit themselves to political and social objectives short of total overthrow of the government.

Internal conflict is the next term requiring definition.

Internal conflict represents a step down from insurgency on the scale of violence and organization. It consists of violence between groups in society or directed against authority. Action in this category often results from real or perceived social, economic, political, or ethnic grievances. Its aim is to draw attention to, or gain redress of these grievances. It is usually contained by local and/or state law enforcement agencies; however, it sometimes requires federal assistance to quell. Internal conflict is often characterized by spontaneous action and a very low level of organization.

Acts of terrorism often accompany the types of conflict described above. Terrorism can also be a primary means used by a hostile group in society. In its generic sense, terrorism is the unlawful use of, or threat of, force or violence against people or property to coerce or intimidate governments or societies, often to achieve political, religious, or ideological objectives.⁵ A more specific form of terrorism is narco-terrorism. Terrorism in this form constitutes terrorist acts committed to achieve the goals or objectives of organized narcotics traffickers, or drug trafficking conducted in support of terrorists having political goals.

Action directed against subversive or openly hostile groups relies upon accurate intelligence. Intelligence in this study refers to the product resulting from the collection, processing, integration, analysis, evaluation, and interpretation of all available information concerning threats to the national security.

This study assumes that the United States is responsive to the same factors of social cohesion and disintegration which have led to the establishment and internal destruction of other nations. It further assumes that the United States will not exist for perpetuity in its present condition. This study presumes that social change is an on-going process and will alter the distribution of power in the United States. It finally supposes that the majority of American citizens are loyal to the government and generally obedient to its laws and norms of behavior.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study is limited by the nature of the research question. It tries to assess the "potential" for internal warfare. There are no quantitative or scientific, analytical tools for measuring or precisely determining when, where, or if internal warfare will occur. The study can only identify, based on historical and social survey, characteristics of societies which have fallen victim to insurgency and/or internal warfare. This study examines potential or actual violent groups in the United States with the aim of isolating their motives in terms of those characteristics. The current state of American society is then compared and contrasted with the identified

characteristics, so this study can make an estimation of the potential for internal warfare in the United States.

Significance of the Study

This study is intended to lead the general reader to a better understanding of the characteristics and determinants which precede domestic insurgency and internal warfare. An examination of the characteristics of stability, as well as instability, and their juxtaposition to the current state of American society illustrates problems and possibly a step toward their solution. The study provides a look at groups within our society which have become disaffected for a variety of reasons. At the very least this study is instructive to the reader by bringing to light some of the darker corners of American society represented by these hostile groups.

For the military reader this study proves significant from a different perspective. The study examines the current laws and regulations which govern military involvement in domestic conflict and law enforcement. This study proves significant to all military professionals who consider the possibility of internal warfare becoming a reality in the United States. Considering the oath of commissioning taken by all officers which binds them to the proposition that they will defend the Constitution against all enemies foreign and domestic, the issue of internal warfare casts military careers in a different light. The military has enjoyed a very comfortable position in which no significant internal enemies have existed. This study provokes some critical thought and helps to solidify the total scope of duty as military officers. To this point the military has only had to deal with

half of the threat. In modern times no significant internal threat has arisen, but this is not to say that it can not. By examining the potential for internal warfare, this study proves of interest for both the general and military reader. It also points out current limitations on the use of military force to combat internal threats and gives recommendations for future use.

Organization

This study consists of five chapters. Background and introductory information is given in chapter 1. Chapter 2 describes the characteristics and determinants of both social stability and instability. It then examines contemporary U.S. society to determine if the characteristics of conflict are present. Chapter 3 looks at groups which are potentially or actually violent in their attempts to exploit the characteristics of conflict in the U.S. It further describes the amount of support these groups receive from outside the country. A look at U.S. military capability to respond to internal warfare is undertaken in chapter 4. It identifies forces and assets available to combat an internal war threat as well as their state of readiness in this arena. It further surveys doctrine for active military support to civil authorities. Chapter 5 analyzes U.S. society by comparing it to those in conflict. It examines the ability of hostile groups to gain broad based support, and it considers the adequacy of military capability to respond to internal conflict, insurgency or warfare. Chapter 5 then summarizes the entire study and presents conclusions.

Conclusions

This study concludes that the potential for internal warfare is not great at the present time. However, conditions do exist for increased internal conflict and insurgency. The United States has been able to maintain a high degree of stability regardless of its tremendous cultural diversity. The nation may be on its way to cultural tribalism exacerbated by racial, religious, criminal, and ideological conflicts. The social fabric of the United States is wearing thin, and increased violence will further erode the cohesion which has characterized American society. A wide array of groups are exploiting these conflicts. While their current influence remains small, their potential as catalysts for social disintegration cannot be ignored. Local and state law enforcement agencies, National Guard, and active military units are incapable of contending with organized and trained belligerents. A review of military doctrine and training are required to effectively address the problem of internal conflict and insurgency before they occur.

Endnotes

¹Allen Weinstein and R. Jackson Wilson, Freedom and Crisis (New York: Random House, 1978), 913.

² Steven W. Peterson, "Civil Disturbance in The American Urban Environment" (Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College, 1993), 9-11.

³ Ibid., 12-21.

⁴U.S. Army, FM 100-20, Military Operations in Low Intensity Conflict (Washington: Department of the Army, 1990), Glossary-4.

⁵Ibid., Glossary-7.

CHAPTER 2

COHESION AND CONFLICT

Characteristics of National Stability

The primary question posed by this paper, concerning the potential for internal warfare in the United States, presupposes an existing, or at least previous, state of social stability and cohesion. Before investigating the causes of, potentials for, or characteristics of internal warfare, a description of stable society is required. The characteristics which define social stability, when absent or lacking, precipitate the converse, social instability. A look at both conditions gives a framework for analysis of contemporary American society.

A simple definition of a nation begins to identify those conditions which are basic to the understanding of national stability. Webster's New World Dictionary defines a nation as "a stable, historically developed community of people with a territory, economic life, distinctive culture and language in common."¹

Arthur M. Schlesinger writes in The Disuniting of America of an upcoming era of ethnic and racial hatred unchecked by superpower restraints.² The Cold War, according to Schlesinger, was an historical anomaly which forced together people of various ethnic and racial backgrounds into artificially cohesive societies. He states that: "When people with different languages, religions and ethnic origins settle on the same territory under a common government tribal hostilities will

drive them apart unless some common purpose holds them together."³ In the case of the United States the common purpose to which he refers is the process of willing assimilation into a cohesive society. Those social, political, economic, and historical conditions which lend cohesion to homogeneous groups can perform the opposite function in a pluralistic society such as the United States if great care is not taken to insure their amelioration. From this short discussion we have a list of nine characteristics, each falling under one of the categories above, which describe stable societies. These do not comprise an exhaustive list of all such characteristics. However, for the purposes of this study they will suffice. Again the characteristics are stability, distinctive culture, common language, ethnic origins, religion, historical development, territory, government, and economic life.

Social Conditions

Stability can also be expressed as "order," or a sense of permanence. It is the acceptance of a system of laws and mores. Without order a society can not exist for even the most basic social functions will be impossible to execute. Writing in his book The Roots of American Order, Russell Kirk states that "Order is the first need of the commonwealth," and that order is a prerequisite for justice and freedom. A society with no respect or adherence to accepted standards of behavior or limits on the impulses of man can never hope to attain justice for its citizens or even the freedom to act toward that end. According to Kirk, the longstanding customs and traditions of a society embodied in law give restraint to those impulses and provide a

foundation which joins the generations and ties individuals to families, to communities, and finally to the nation.⁵

Culture is the socially transmitted behavior patterns, arts, beliefs, and institutions which are characteristic of a population.⁶ The commonality of behaviors and beliefs bind people together and give them comfort, especially in the face of differing or competing cultures. Most people find stability in their own culture and are very conservative, if not hostile, toward any changes in its character.

Culture is expressed in a variety of ways. The most common means of expression, however, is language. Language unites people through communication and expresses the uniqueness and individuality of themselves and of their culture. The English language was the great unifier of the American frontier. The quickest way to gain acceptance in the New World was to learn the language. Schlesinger asserts that non-English immigrants experienced rejection and hostility until they blended in through use of the standard language.⁷ Separation by language barriers inhibits assimilation and the sense of community required for stability. The opposite, however, facilitates empathy and generates cohesion among people of even various cultural origins.

To an even greater extent than language, ethnic origin, or race, binds together people who share the same ethnic composition. People derive great comfort by being among their own ethnic group just as they do by living in their native culture. According to Schlesinger, people came to America to develop a new culture and national identification which allowed them to bond together.

The United States had a brilliant solution for the inherent fragility of a multi-ethnic society: the creation of a brand new national identity, carried forward by individuals who, in forsaking old loyalties and joining to make new lives, melted away ethnic differences.⁸

In cases where ethnic identity carries no outward differences in appearance, this has worked very well. Unfortunately, where racial barriers exist so too does disunity. This fact, however, does not diminish the stabilizing influence which derives from ethnic origins.

Characteristics such as language, economy, ethnicity, and territory have outward manifestations. A people's religion often times remains in the inner domain of their consciences. There is, however, an inextricable link between religion and social stability, and it is especially apparent where people recognize their dependence upon a moral authority which transcends man--that is God.

Yet practical government in the United States, and in every other nation, is possible only because most people in that nation accept the existence of some moral order, by which they govern their conduct--the order of the soul.⁹

Kirk speaks of the inner order of the soul, expressed through private morals, and the outer order of society, expressed through public law. Both are dependent on the other, and where they are out of balance disorder will occur.

The bonds of social stability in the United States owe a great deal to the unifying presence of the Christian Faith. The Puritan founders of America felt a parallel experience to that of the Jews during their exodus from Egypt. They felt that they too were escaping persecution, and they were being led by God to a land which His will determined to be theirs. Their adherence to a common faith and to commonly accepted morals allowed them a huge degree of social cohesion

even though they belonged to different sects of the Christian Faith.¹⁰ Religious freedom held an esteemed position in the minds of the founding fathers. However, the fact that the United States was to be a Christian nation cannot be avoided. Patrick Henry expressed the concept of religious tolerance in a Christian nation.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly or too often that this great nation was founded, not by religionists (pluralism), but by Christians; not on religions, but on the gospel of Jesus Christ! For this very reason peoples of other faiths have been afforded asylum, prosperity, and freedom of worship here.¹¹

The stabilizing influence of religion in society is great particularly when it exists in either one form, or in many common forms each adhering to commonly accepted moral standards.

Historical Conditions

The collective ties of a nation, or its historical development, are integral components of its stability. History defines a nation just as a family tree defines an individual. The cumulative experiences of the past determine the present state of being as well as directing our social energies to the future. Respect for a nation rests heavily upon the acceptance and appreciation for its history, its heroes, and culture. Kirk states that the legacies of Jerusalem, Athens, Rome, and London prescribe western civilization, and specifically these legacies have given American society its core values upon which our history proceeded.¹²

Political Conditions

The concept of a politically sovereign nation defies imagination without a defined territory. The entire history of the United States is

inextricably tied to the concept of territory. Colonial beginnings, the fight for independence, westward expansion, and civil war all had a central theme--territory. A community of people or nation bands together for common purposes within the bounds of territory which they collectively view as their home. Their territory merits defense, because it contains the resources which drive their economic life and survival.

Religion lends stability to the "inner order" of the soul, and public law stabilizes and gives form to the "outer order" of society. Government, of course, represents the law to the common man. The power of government to stabilize society cannot be overstated. The many characteristics of a government structure and its policies, as well as the personality and quality of its leadership, determine its ability to unify the population which it represents. The United States Government has successfully maintained its stability throughout some two-hundred plus years because its structure, policies, and personalities have conformed to American society. Kirk declares that the Constitution worked and still endures because it expresses the laws, customs, habits and popular beliefs of Americans.¹³

Economic Conditions

Economic life is an absolutely essential component of social stability. Societies, having developed intricate economic systems, depend upon their maintenance and growth, not only for survival, but also for their sense of worth and power within the world. Kirk maintains that the economic decay of ancient Rome was one of the four

major causes of that society's fall.¹⁴ Without doubt, the economic life of a nation greatly determines the stability of its society.

Precursors of Conflict

Social instability stems from a variety of social, political, economic, historical and environmental conditions. Cohesion demands a certain degree of compliance and acceptance of common norms of behavior, as well as some tolerance for dissent. While the characteristics discussed above lend themselves to stability, given the right mix of circumstances, they can also serve to inflame hostility, leading to conflict, insurgency, and internal war.

Perceived Relative Deprivation

There are many theories and models to explain instability and violence in society. U.S. Army doctrine uses Ted Robert Gurr's book, Why Men Rebel, as a starting point to understanding political violence. Gurr explores the motivations for insurgency and provides a model for analysis of rebellion. According to Gurr, all societies have social, political, and economic conditions which can be exploited by a group for insurgent motives.¹⁵ He advances a theory of "Perceived Relative Deprivation" (PRD) to explain the friction in society which, if allowed to reach critical levels, will motivate men to armed rebellion. The gulf between a group's "value expectations" and its "value capabilities" comprises PRD which is the root cause of insurgency. "Value expectations" are those things which a group thinks they have a right to receive. "Value capabilities" are what they can realistically achieve.

When the two become critically imbalanced conditions exist which can give rise to social conflict, insurgency, or even internal war.

The "perception" part of PRD determines the criticality of the "deprivation." The conditions in one society, or within a subgroup of that society, might be perfectly acceptable, yet inflammatory in another. PRD can be illustrated by the example of an agrarian society in which the common farmer expects only the basics of life-- food, shelter, and clothing. As long as his capability to attain these remains constant, and he is not convinced or coerced to believe otherwise, he is likely to remain nonviolent and content with his situation. Exposure to mass media, or the visible improvement of other groups in his society can increase his value expectations unrealistically beyond his capabilities and generate the perception of deprivation.

Similarly, a loss of value capabilities can generate PRD. In more developed societies, like the United States, this is particularly likely to induce violence when expectations do not fall consistent with the loss of capabilities. Economic depression, loss of political power and status, or unfavorable resolution of a social issue can conceivably give rise to PRD in developed societies. While Gurr's theory is primarily used to analyze foreign insurgencies, it has applications in American society. PRD applies here to groups frustrated by social or political issues which are not resolved to their satisfaction. These groups can range from extreme religious oriented groups who perceive a loss of social power, to minority groups who perceive injustice regarding their economic and social status. In the absence of socially

accepted behaviors or productive skills, violence presents a viable means to redress of their grievances.

A government's response to the perceived deprivation of its constituent groups is a key factor in determining the progression and duration of social instability. The ability of the American democratic system to respond to changing needs within society as well as to allow political participation is key to abating violence. Governments showing a high degree of rigidity, of course, are much more likely to confront situations involving political violence. If constituted authority fails to adequately address conditions of discontent, social conflict will ensue. Some of the factors advanced by Gurr which lend themselves to exploitation by violent groups are:

- a. The breakdown of traditional social organizations and customs as a result of contact with other cultures
- b. Rapidly changing economic, social, and political conditions
- c. A rapidly expanding population
- d. Urbanization
- e. Industrialization
- f. A political vacuum created by departure of a colonial power
- g. Government ineptitude, corruption, and/or tyranny
- h. Political instability
- i. Widespread unemployment, underemployment, or poverty
- j. A dominant foreign economic presence
- k. Deep social or economic divisions
- l. Single crop and/or single product dependence

From the list above and the preceding discussion, it can easily be said that the amount of social, political, and economic divisions which characterize a nation determine the proportion of instability present.

Doctrinal View of Instability

An understanding of the characteristics which result in social instability requires a short discussion of all five categories of analysis: social, economic, political, historical, and environmental. According to U.S. Army Field Manual 100-20, Military Operations in Low Intensity Conflict, to analyze the nature of a conflict, detailed study of the nature of society, the insurgency, and the government are required.¹⁶ The nature of society is the major concern at this point. Under this topic, five major categories of analysis are given which coincide with the previous discussion.

Social Conditions

The social organization of a nation gives clear indications, if not blatant evidence, of social instability. Social groups identified by race, religion, ethnic or national origin, tribe, economic class, political affiliation, and ideology exhibit cohesion and conflict in varying degrees. Alliances or points of contention arise between groups often depending upon the PRD that one or more of the groups feel in regard to the others. Active or potential issues strongly contested by various social groups motivate their political behavior which sometimes progresses to the stage of violent conflict.

Economic Conditions

Besides the social and ethnic roots of conflict, economic organization and performance play a key role. Groups within a society can pursue conflicting goals concerning economic structure, ideology, performance, and growth. Unequal or unfair distribution of wealth, tax burden, employment benefits, and a myriad of other elements often induce feelings of injustice which can precipitate violent conflict.

Political Conditions

The economic state of a nation relies heavily upon the nature of its political organization. Issues such as government competence, decision making mechanisms, distribution of power among competing groups, degree of popular political representation, and judicial independence influence stability. If these factors are arrayed to the exclusion or disadvantage of certain groups, instability and/or political violence might result.

Historical Conditions

Groups within society usually do not rebel at the slightest provocation. A history of abuse or neglect of certain groups in society might precede violent conflict. The social history then of a nation gives rise to instability when that history has been unbalanced in its treatment of particular groups. Other historical factors include the origins of government, and its record concerning transition of power. A society suffering under a government not deriving its power from the citizenry, or one which has a history of political violence will often find itself mired in instability and conflict.

Environmental Conditions

The last of the conditions identified by FM 100-20 is the social and geographic environment. The social environment refers to demographic patterns based on factors such as race, language, age, religion, and cultural composition. Coupled with the geographic analysis of society, specific areas of actual or potential instability are identifiable.

Symptoms of a Dying Nation

Another model of instability is provided by Jim Nelson Black. In his book, When Nations Die, he offers ten symptoms of a dying nation. He says that these symptoms in sufficient strength or combination indicate the impending demise of a culture.¹⁷ Looking at his symptoms of decline, they can be placed under all but one of the categories given in FM 100-20.

Six of his ten symptoms fall under the category of social instability. They are increased lawlessness, decline of education, weakening of cultural foundations, rise of immorality, decay of religious belief, and devaluing of human life.

Black provides two economic symptoms of decline. He asserts that the loss of economic discipline and increased materialism are characteristic of social decay. The remaining two symptoms, rising bureaucracy and loss of respect for tradition, are political and historical respectively.

In summary, the characteristics of social stability and/or instability lie within five broad categories--social, political,

economic, historical, and environmental. A host of specific characteristics can be applied to each of the five categories, none of which can by itself adequately explain the origins of either stability or instability. Only by examining the specific details of a particular society can you analyze the conditions and apply the appropriate characteristics to the situation at hand.

Disorder in the Extreme

A prime example of social instability and an analysis of the causal characteristics is given by Robert D. Kaplan in his article, "The Coming Anarchy." Kaplan surveys the existing conditions of West Africa and offers a grim assessment of the future world order based on his findings. While African society is far from analogous to American, it serves as an extreme example of disorder and does illustrate "possibilities" to which Americans are not immune. Looking at the situation in terms of the five categories of analysis posed by FM 100-20, a model of disorder is revealed.

Social Disorder

The most prominent characteristic of the social order in the cities of West Africa is crime. Kaplan notes that, "The cities of West Africa at night are some of the unsafest places in the world."¹⁸ Additionally, he speaks of "an increasing lawlessness that is far more significant than any coup, rebel incursion, or episodic experiment in democracy." Rampant and unprovoked crimes are committed by gangs of youth who are seemingly unrestrained by any moral code or inhibitions against violence.

The people of West Africa are not only assailed by criminals, but also by disease. Kaplan says, "defending oneself against malaria in Africa is becoming more like defending oneself against violent crime."¹⁹ Malaria, AIDS, and tuberculosis run rampant throughout this part of the world. "Of the approximately 12 million people worldwide whose blood is HIV-positive, 8 million are in Africa."²⁰ Additionally, 45 percent of all tuberculosis patients are also HIV-positive. Health officials fear a mutation or hybrid form of AIDS will appear and be even more deadly than the present strain.

Ethnic and religious cleavages are deepening in Africa, particularly in Nigeria where Muslims and Christians, as well as a multitude of tribal groups are asserting power. The nation; consequently, is becoming ungovernable.²¹ By contrast, Arab North Africa enjoys a great deal of social stability due to their ingrained Islamic faith and its permeation of every facet of their society. West Africa suffers social chaos largely to blame on their superficial embrace of religion, be that Christianity or Islam.

Directly related to their religious demise is the nearly non-existent family structure. Polygamy thrives in Sub-Saharan Africa, and an epidemic of unattached youth has resulted. Tremendously high birth rates and correspondingly high rates of HIV transmission combine to undermine the foundations of their society.

Political Disorder

The social conditions present in West Africa reflect upon the political state of affairs. Government agencies stand impotent against the waves of crime and refugee migrations which have all but dissolved

the political boundaries between nations. In fact, some military units participate in the disorder by threatening travelers and aligning themselves with village chiefs rather than to their head of state. Clan based societies are particularly vulnerable to fragmentation along local or regional lines based on clan affiliation. Public works, facilities and services lie in disrepair, and crime cartels are more capable of delivering services and security to the people than are government agencies.

Economic Disorder

Disastrous economic conditions have created what has been called "the revenge of the poor" in Sierra Leone.²² Generations of poverty have resulted in a youthful population who know nothing of social order or morality. Scarce resources and lack of any economic opportunities have left them with a sense of hopelessness and resentment for anyone possessing prosperity. The withdraw of colonial powers took with it the management expertise and economic visibility which they formerly enjoyed.

Environmental Disorder

The social and geographic environment of West Africa now supports instability. Dramatic urbanization, which creates dense slums, facilitates crime, disease, family and cultural disintegration and ethnic strife. Currently, 55 percent of the Ivory Coast's population is urban, and it is projected to reach 62 percent by the year 2,000.²³ Consider this with the fact that only 8 percent of the country is now

forested compared to its former 38 percent, and the hostile nature of their physical environment becomes very evident.²⁴

Historical Disorder

Historically, the countries of West Africa do not have the skills or resources to balance such an array of problems. Power often has changed hands violently, and western ideas of democracy have never really taken hold. A long history of violence, tribal conflict and a shallow sense of national identity contribute to the chaos.

The above example of social instability serves as an extreme demonstration. It also provides a worst case scenario of what U.S. society could become. Recalling the assumption that the United States is responsive to the same factors of social cohesion and disintegration as are other nations, Americans can look at West Africa and see what must be done, or sometimes undone, to maintain our stability.

America Coming Unglued

The conditions and characteristics of both stability and instability have been determined, as well as the five categories of analysis which this study applies. From these factors it can be shown that many of the conditions which precede internal conflict do in fact exist and thrive in America. The question of their applicability to internal conflict, insurgency, or internal warfare remains to be seen. For now, a look at these conditions will set the stage for further analysis.

Social Friction

The social fabric of America has not always been uniformly strong. This country has undergone periods of moderate to extreme fragmentation as well as cohesion. The bonds of cohesion, however, are very fragile. As Schlesinger has said, the current trend toward loosening those bonds is driving the country to a state of tribalization.²⁵ Differences between racial/ethnic groups over issues such as language, education, history, and immigration are driving wedges between Americans which can only do damage to the social order. Additionally, religion based culture clashes are becoming more virulent, and crime is reducing parts of society to the absolute base level.

Ethnic/Racial Divisions

The United States is suffering from a "cult of ethnicity" which threatens to turn the country into a patchwork of "ethnic islands"²⁶ rather than a nation of individuals who have assimilated into the American fabric. It seems as if everyone in America now must be identified by some cultural label rather than by the overriding label "American." Newscasters and politicians frequently make reference to African-Americans, Native-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, Asian-Americans, and every possible kind of American. This, of course, is not a new phenomenon, and by itself presents no serious problem. Taken together, however, with the current trend of ethnic and racial divisiveness, it could blossom into a serious threat to the nation. Teddy Roosevelt decried this problem when he said, "We can have no fifty-fifty allegiance in this country, . . . Either a man is an American and nothing else, or he is not an American at all."²⁷

Mass migrations, mixing of people in terms of geography and society, rapid transportation, mass communications, population growth, and the death of communism have created conditions where race and ethnicity have replaced ideology as the divisive issue of our times. These conditions have had their effect on America. In earlier times, immigrants came to America and cut their ties to the old world, partly from a desire to adopt the American identification and partly from necessity. The physical separation, and lack of communications and transportation prevented continuance of their bonds to the past. Technology, however, allows the lines of communication to remain open; consequently, the pressure to blend into the American mold is greatly reduced, if not eliminated.

Ethnic separatism is currently exposed in California where even illegal immigrants are marching in protest over Proposition 187 which denies them public education, non-emergency health care, and other social services.²⁸ Their loyalties were clearly shown on the 17 October, 1994 CNN news broadcast. Many of the marchers carried Mexican flags as symbols of protest and were filmed as they ripped an American flag from the hands of a counter demonstrator and stomped it into the pavement. The Hispanic protesters and their supporters assume that racism lies at the heart of the issue, rather than the issue of economics--the state tax base cannot indefinitely support services to non-citizens. Schlesinger sums up the potential damage of ethnic separatism by saying that, "The one certain way to destroy America is to let it degenerate into a mess of hyphenated Americans."²⁹

Concurrent with this mood of hyphenation is the push for bilingual education. Language was the great unifier of the American frontier, and it still promotes integration and cohesion in society. Respect for one's ethnic background surely merits concern, but not at the expense of national cohesion and order. The Los Angeles Unified School District stands as an example of linguistic fragmentation. Over 100 different languages are spoken in the 700 schools which make up the district. Taken with the additional fact that 33 percent of the students there speak only limited English, a model of ethnic isolation reveals itself.³⁰

The trend toward ethnic separatism is being propelled by our educational system, particularly at the university level. The traditional idea of assimilation into the melting pot is drowning in the wake of ethnic fragmentation. Multiculturalism is now a center piece of public education. Schlesinger attacks this move and says, "The militants of ethnicity now contend that a main objective of public education should be the protection, strengthening; celebration and perpetuation of ethnic origins and identification."³¹

Black students and educators are in particular embracing this concept. Schlesinger states that the cult of ethnicity and Afrocentrism, if taken too far, can threaten the republic.³² Black, revisionist historians have created exaggerated claims of African superiority to compensate for years of exclusion by the White system. Black history and contributions to society were relegated to the back pages or completely omitted from our history books. Rather than rewriting history in a dishonest form, whatever the good intentions, a

balance of truthful research should dominate education. The search for a mythical past is fruitless and denies the fact that minorities live in the United States which is culturally European.³³ Black Americans are by every practical measure European.

The vast majority of U.S. citizens are of European descent, and most of those who are not are culturally European. Education and other social institutions can not ignore this fact even though America has been and still is an experiment in multi-ethnic society. Adherence to common ideals, political institutions, language, and culture have formed the bonds of cohesion which have held this nation together. A majority must rule this nation; not a majority based on race or ethnic origin, but one based on common principles of freedom, democracy, morality, and European cultural norms.

Assimilation and cohesion are unattainable goals, according to many Black-Americans. While other groups have been able to blend into the American fabric, Blacks have been excluded by their circumstances of birth.

In his book Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal, Andrew Hacker contends that Black-Americans have been, and continue to be, victimized by racism which permeates every level of society. The residue of slavery still exists in America and is manifested through White's beliefs and attitudes concerning the inferior and primitive nature of Blacks.³⁴ He feels that Blacks have been denied "full nationality,"³⁵ and despite their contributions to society they are forever categorized as separate people who can not measure up to the expectations and achievements of White America. Even though a Black

family exhibits all the traits of European, American civility, they will not gain acceptance in America.³⁶

Though Blacks comprise over 12 percent of the population they continue to suffer discrimination. The effects of this discrimination is felt in a variety of ways. The social effects which ensue from discrimination, according to Hacker and many Blacks, account for a large measure of black crime, poverty, illegitimacy, drug addiction, and underachievement. Disparities in income, education, employment, housing, crime, and political representation owe their beginnings to racism. The fact that a large portion of Blacks ascribe to this view and harbor feelings of resentment reveals an exploitable condition for violent conflict.

Crime

As noted earlier, order is the first need of society.³⁷ Nothing does more to create disorder in society than does crime. Black says of the United States:

Once a model of peace, prosperity, and responsible citizenship to the rest of the world, the United States today is obviously a nation in chaos, a broken and humiliated empire apparently on the verge of collapse.³⁸

These are harsh and alarming words, but in light of the realities of our criminal rampage, they ring true.

The United States is enthralled by crime. It becomes public entertainment especially when it involves either a well known figure, or it is of a sensational nature. Mass murderers, such as Ted Bundy, John Wayne Gacy, and Charles Manson, become nearly folk heroes in a perverted sense. This, however, is not the type of crime which is tearing our

nation apart. Murder, rape, robbery, assault, and narcotics trafficking are chief among the crimes which are bringing disorder to the nation.

Violent crime in America is popularly reported as "epidemic." Like a cancer it has attached itself to the American public body and has grown geometrically over time. In the calendar year 1961-1962, 250,000 violent crimes were reported in the United States. In the year 1989-1990, the number had grown to 1,700,000.³⁹ Even considering the fact that the Department of Justice reported a 14 percent decline in violent crime from 1985 to 1992,⁴⁰ this represents a significant rise in crime. The social cost of this defies a price tag. The ultimate price is paid in the loss of social and moral capital and their accompanying disorder.

Urban street gangs have arisen across America. Drug dealing, extortion, and murder characterize their activities. As of 1993, it was reported that at least 187 cities in America had gangs, with a total of 1,000 different gangs and 150,000 members nation wide.⁴¹ Los Angeles County which is notorious for gang activity has over 100,000 gang members alone.⁴² Gang membership is increasing daily, and no concrete figures are available to document its scope. Phoenix Arizona reported as recently as 1994 that they had 140 gangs with 3,600 documented members out of an estimated six to eight thousand total.⁴³

The effects of international drug trafficking bear heavily on American society. American values continue to erode partly as a result of the deleterious effects of the drug trade. Americans consume nearly 60 percent of the world's illicit drugs, and we now claim six million regular cocaine users and one half million heroin addicts. The U.S. share in the annual drug trade is estimated at over one hundred billion

dollars, or twice what the nation spends on oil. Courts and penal institutions are choked with drug criminals with over one third of all federal prison incarcerations related to drug crime.⁴⁴ The importance of the drug threat warrants a place in the President's National Security Strategy. Under the objective of "Enhancing our Security," a section is devoted to "Fighting Drug Trafficking."

The administration has undertaken a new approach to the global scourge of drug abuse and trafficking that will better integrate domestic and international activities to reduce both the demand and the supply of drugs.⁴⁵

Religious Divisions

Drug abuse, crime, and racism plague American society with no relief, or even means of relief, in sight. Conservative Christians assert that the common thread which connects these problems is morality. They contend that without a consensus of moral belief, America is adrift in a sea of moral decay and appears to be sinking fast. The foundation of American morality is the Bible, and American, conservative Christians cite the erosion of biblical beliefs and values in society as the primary cause of these problems.

Unlike many nations in the world, the U.S. has no violent religious strife which threatens to explode in disorder. Religious freedom was written into our Constitution and is a fundamental tenet of life in America. Even with a large degree of religious tolerance, religious belief still defines lines of conflict in society. The battle lines are drawn along central issues such as abortion rights, assisted suicide, school prayer, and homosexual rights. One issue which

underlies these, however, is the question of separation of church and state.

"Separation of church and state" is so often heard in public discourse that many people believe that it is a quote from the Constitution. Nowhere does this phrase appear in either the Constitution or any other founding document of this nation.⁴⁶ The 1947 Supreme Court Decision in Everson v. Board of Education declared a separation of church and state in the First Amendment. Proceeding from that case has been a plethora of others which have been destructive to the Christian consensus upon which this nation was founded. Religious education and prayer in public schools were declared unconstitutional in 1962 (Engel v. Vitale).⁴⁷ Nativity scenes are routinely ordered removed from public property, and a 1980 decision declared that, "It is unconstitutional for the Ten Commandments to hang on the walls of a classroom since the students might be lead to read them, meditate upon them, respect them, or obey them."⁴⁸

American, conservative Christians are dismayed by a society beset with social problems with obvious moral roots, but which refuses to acknowledge the source of American moral order--religion. George Washington's farewell address contained a line which sums up the issue.

And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion, Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds . . . reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail, in exclusion of religious principle.⁴⁹

The single most divisive issue in America, abortion, is hotly contested by conservative Christians. The value of human life is held dear by Christians, since man is made in the image of God⁵⁰ who knew us

before birth.⁵¹ The fact that "30 million unborn babies have been killed by abortions in this nation"⁵² since Roe v. Wade in 1973, sharply, and sometimes violently, divides segments of U.S. society. This issue has moved beyond protests and petitions. The death sentence given to Paul Hill for the 29 July, 1994 double murder of an abortionist and his escort in Florida might even encourage others to carry their objections to violence.⁵³

Assisted suicide represents another display of devaluing human life. Dr. Jack Kevorkian's "suicide machine" and his near celebrity status on television news exposes the other end of the human life issue. His efforts to legalize assisted suicide for the elderly, disabled, retarded, or others who possess a "low quality of life" run into conflict with Christian belief.⁵⁴ The Bible clearly states that man's body is the temple of God and no one should destroy it.⁵⁵ It follows then that suicide is punishable by God and is impermissible in Christian society.

Religious issues which are dividing society are seen by conservative Christians as issues of right vs. wrong and of good vs. evil. They contend that a cultural and spiritual war rages in America over the souls of its citizens and the character of the nation. F. LaGard Smith contends that, "Gay rights has become a key battleground precisely because, with homosexual behavior being the issue, the stark difference between right and wrong will never be clearer."⁵⁶ Homosexuality does not limit its effects to private sexual expression; it threatens the survival of our civilization.⁵⁷ Very clearly the Bible condemns homosexuality,⁵⁸ and those who argue the point do so in

opposition to the religious foundation of America. These religious issues have only erupted in violence over the abortion issue. However, as the political outcome of these issues continues to be decided against the wishes of conservative Christians, the potential for violence increases.

Political Friction

American political organization exists among the competing demands described above as well as innumerable other demands and requirements. The system, due to the genius of the Constitution, remains intact and appears to respond despite frequent cries to the contrary.

Minority representation, however, remains a sore spot in American political life. The November 1994 elections were seen as a huge loss for minority representation in Congress. Although Blacks lost only two seats in the House of Representatives, the Republican gain of fifty-two seats greatly disturbs Black Americans.⁵⁹ Minority groups view the conservative trend in U.S. politics with fear. The polarization between minorities who generally vote Democrat and White males who strongly voted Republican represents to minority groups the racist undertone of American politics. The possibility of cuts in social programs, such as welfare, child care, and public housing, arouses great concern among America's minorities.

Economic Friction

Added to the racial, religious, criminal, and political issues dividing America, economic problems enter the equation of national

instability. Income disparity among groups in America remains a point of contention, and government deficit and debt loom in the background always threatening to ignite a financial bomb which will dramatically upset the order of society.

Income disparity is best illustrated by comparing median family incomes of White and Black families. White families as of 1990 earned a median income of \$36,915 compared to \$21,423 for Blacks.⁶⁰ Level of education might account for some of the difference, but even when the levels are the same a disparity exists to the detriment of black men. A black man with a high school education earns \$764 per \$1,000 earned by his white counterpart. Black college graduates earn \$798 per \$1,000 of white income. The figures are markedly better for black females who earn slightly more than white males, if they both have a college degree.

The specter of economic collapse always hangs in the background of American economics. The runaway spending of government and the tax and regulation drain on business are recurring issues in economic debate. The fear of an economic disaster is fueled by their debates as well as by the facts of a \$4.4 trillion national debt, \$4.6 billion in government spending every day, 18.6 million workers on the government payroll, and a 35 percent top tax rate. Americans are constantly reminded of the danger presented by such impressive numbers. While the "experts" and politicians debate their meaning, the economy seems to be relatively stable, and in no danger of imminent collapse. If such a collapse would occur, it would precipitate tremendous social upheaval, and possibly violence on a large scale.

Historical Friction

The social history of the United States renders a mixed decision in reference to its impact on internal conflict. Government as an institution has remained very stable with a low level of political violence affecting its character. Transitions of power have always been peaceful, but conflicts over the distribution of power have often been violent among segments of the public. Although American politics have been relatively free of violence, the fact exists that Americans are a violent people and the use of force has frequented social change.

Environmental Friction

The American social and geographic environments lend themselves to internal conflict or more extreme levels of violence. Urban sprawl with a concentration of politically and economically disaffected minority groups provides fertile ground for the existence of violent organizations. Additionally, the ethnic diversity of the United States and the trend toward ethnic polarization create conditions for exploitation by hostile groups. The vast terrain, both urban and rural, possessed by the U.S. gives concealment to a wide array of potentially violent groups which will be discussed in the next chapter.

A number of serious conditions exist in the United States which could possibly lead to violent, internal conflict, insurgency, or internal war. A degree of PRD accompanies these problems which are exploitable by an organized group intent on large scale violence. The three major areas of concern fall under the social category of analysis. They are ethnic/racial divisions, religious divisions, and crime. Contributing factors, such as language, culture, economy, government

policies, and an environment conducive to conflict, also play in the equation. One or more of the above conditions could ignite the fire which melts the glue of American order.

Endnotes

¹Webster's New World Dictionary, Second College Edition, 1970.

²Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr, The Disuniting of America (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992), 9-10.

³Ibid., 10.

⁴Russell Kirk, The Roots of American Order (La Salle, IL: Open Court Publishing Company, 1974), 6.

⁵Ibid., 473.

⁶The American Heritage Dictionary, Second College Edition, 1985.

⁷Schlesinger, 28-29.

⁸Ibid., 13.

⁹Kirk, 439.

¹⁰Ibid., 12-14.

¹¹David Barton, The Myth of Separation (Aledo, TX, Wallbuilder Press, 1993), 118.

¹²Kirk., 6.

¹³Ibid., 416.

¹⁴Ibid., 128.

¹⁵U.S. Army, Subcourse 551/0. Low Intensity Conflict (Ft. Leavenworth, KS: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1989), 59-64.

¹⁶U.S. Army, FM 100-20 Military Operations in Low Intensity Conflict (Washington: Department of the Army, 1990), C1-C8.

¹⁷Jim Nelson Black, When Nations Die (Wheaton IL: Tyndale House, 1994), XVIII.

¹⁸Robert D. Kaplan, "The Coming Anarchy," Atlantic Monthly, (February 1994): 45.

¹⁹Ibid., 54.

²⁰Ibid., 52.

²¹Ibid., 46-52.

²²Ibid., 44.

²³Ibid., 49.

²⁴Ibid., 48.

²⁵Schlesinger, 18.

²⁶Ibid., 16.

²⁷Ibid., 35.

²⁸"Marchers in L.A. oppose anti-immigration initiative," Kansas City Star, 17 October 1994, A1.

²⁹Schlesinger, 118.

³⁰Steven W. Peterson, "Civil Disturbance in the American Urban Environment: An Evaluation of U.S. Army Doctrine" (MMAS Thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1993), 39.

³¹Schlesinger, 17.

³²Ibid., 71-74.

³³Ibid., 93-106.

³⁴Andrew Hacker, Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal (New York: Ballantine Books, 1992), 14.

³⁵Ibid., 15.

³⁶Ibid., 41.

³⁷Kirk, 6.

³⁸Black, 20.

³⁹Barton, 210.

⁴⁰U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (Washington: Department of Justice, 1994), 448.

⁴¹David R. Hogg, "A Military Campaign Against Gangs" (Monograph, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1993), 26.

⁴²Peterson, 44.

⁴³CPT Mike Denney of the Arizona Department of Public Safety, interviewed by the Foreign Military Studies Office, 24 August 1994, Southwest Border Conference, Phoenix, AZ.

⁴⁴Alvin D. Cantrell, "Drugs and Terror: A Threat to U.S. National Security" (An individual study project, U.S. Army War College, 23 March 1992), 22-23.

⁴⁵The White House, A National Security Strategy Of Engagement And Enlargement (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, July 1994), 6-9.

⁴⁶Barton, 15.

⁴⁷Ibid.

⁴⁸Ibid., 12.

⁴⁹Ibid., 116.

⁵⁰Genesis 1:27, New American Standard Bible (Iowa Falls: World Bible Publishers, 1975), 1.

⁵¹Psalms 139: 13-16.

⁵²Black, 213.

⁵³"Activists: Death sentence won't stop anti-abortion violence," Leavenworth Times, 7 December 1994: A-2.

⁵⁴Black, 211-213.

⁵⁵I Corinthians 3: 16-17.

⁵⁶F. LaGard Smith, Sodom's Second Coming (Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 1993), 35.

⁵⁷Ibid., 99.

⁵⁸Romans 1: 26-27.
I Corinthians 6: 9.

⁵⁹"Minorities Fear Loss of Power," Kansas City Star, 13 November 1994.

⁶⁰Hacker, 94.

CHAPTER 3

HOSTILE AMERICA

An assortment of groups exist within the U.S. which are hostile toward others in society, the government, or both. Some of these groups pose the prospect of or are engaging in violent behavior. The array of beliefs and motivations which these groups hold run the gamut from extreme, right wing, racism to criminal, financial gain. Although they have pronounced differences, they do share some traits in common. Among their similarities are the themes of conspiracy and persecution. They spend considerable time looking over their shoulder for the conspirators from the government or opposing religious group who are bent on their destruction. Attending this belief is their feeling of persecution which they are sure has victimized their group. This study has identified four basic types of hostile groups. The groups differ in their primary motivations which are based upon race, religion, criminal gain, and general opposition to the U.S. Government.

Racial/Ethnic Hate Groups

Race has been a recurring source of conflict in the United States for its entire history. Northern European settlers brought with them their particular animosity for other racial and ethnic groups. Over time it was expressed toward Native Americans, African slaves, Orientals, and other Europeans who had different cultural habits and

behaviors than did the majority of people. Racial animosity, however, is not confined to Northern Europeans alone. All racial, ethnic, linguistic, and cultural groups prejudge others and have feelings of their own superiority, or at least strong preferences for their own kind.

The United States has experienced varying degrees of success at assimilating diverse groups into society. Where differences are noted by outward appearance, the most malicious forms of hostility have endured. As noted, American society has been blessed with a high degree of stability and order which have controlled racial emotions and checked their damage. In spite of this, problems remain, and a number of groups thrive on the animus resulting from racial differences. Discussed below is only a sample of the groups in America with a propensity toward violence. A number of them have been neutralized by the arrest and convictions of key members. However, their ideology survives, and the groups reconstitute under new names and leadership.

The Identity Movement

The Identity Movement consists of a number of nominally, Christian churches and organizations which espouse extreme racial hatred and ill-founded religious doctrine. Among their purported religious beliefs is the notion that the U.S. is the true Holy Land, and true identification of Israel.¹ They preach a second coming of Christ which will be preceded by a race war in America. During this time, they will cleanse America of its racially impure elements and rebuild the "New Israel." Besides their twisting of biblical concepts, the Identity Movement also uses a novel, The Turner Diaries, as a philosophical basis

for their beliefs.² This novel, written by a leading neo-nazi, William Pierce, conveys the story of a race war in America during which Whites violently subdue the nation and restore it to its pure state.

Identity groups openly oppose payment of income taxes, and advocate the stockpiling of survival equipment, food, and weapons. Common among the claims of Identity members is that the U.S. is controlled by a "Zionist Occupation Government" (ZOG). A number of groups are aligned with this movement, all of which share the common themes of racism, government oppression, and perverted Christianity.

Aryan Nations

Prominent among the Identity Groups is the Aryan Nations. Headquartered on a small plot of land at Hayden Lake, Idaho, this group hosts an annual "World Congress"³ of white supremacists. During the 1987 meeting, approximately 200 people attended. The "Rev" Richard Butler leads the organization's "Church of Jesus Christ Christian" at Hayden Lake.

The Aryan Nation compound appears to be a paramilitary training camp equipped with guard towers, sentry dogs, and armed guards. Nazi German march music plays over a loud speaker system while volunteer workers mail printed literature and cassette tapes to members around the country.

The size of this organization is unknown, but its leader claims adherents nation wide. Their recruiting efforts are not confined to the general public. Aryan Nation chapters exist, not only in the U.S. and Canada, but also in federal and state penitentiaries around the country.⁴ Active recruitment, loan sharking, gambling, extortion, and

suspected murder characterize their prison activities. Aryan Nations serves as a conduit between other like minded groups around the U.S. Members often operate with other groups and frequent migration between them occurs.

A degree of sophistication is being achieved by this group. One of Butler's key followers, Louis Beam, started a computer network which links right wing, hate groups across the United States. Beam, however, was arrested in Mexico in 1987 after having fled the United States in the face of charges that he conspired to overthrow the government.

The Arizona Patriots

A localized chapter of the Identity Movement, the Arizona Patriots, advocates the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government, and the containment of the nation's Black and Jewish populations. Eight members were arrested in 1986 for selling Uzi submachineguns and plotting the robbery of an armored car.⁵ When arrested, the group had blueprints for several major utility sites in Arizona including the Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado River. Their 320 acre camp contained a number of weapons and explosives. Additionally, they had planned the killing of a Jewish banker, and the bombing of abortion clinics, synagogues, and IRS offices.

The Covenant The Sword and Arm of the Lord (CSA)

The CSA was closely aligned with the Aryan Nations and other white supremacist, neo-nazi groups. Their leader, James Ellison, a former fundamentalist minister from San Antonio, Texas, started a 220 acre survivalist commune for the group. Located along the Missouri-

Arkansas border, it was used, not only as a home for its 100 members, but also as a training camp. The curriculum consisted of marksmanship, wilderness survival skills, and urban warfare.⁶ Sharing the apocalyptic view of the Aryan Nations, Ellison's group collected and stored weapons, explosives and food for the "coming economic collapse" and attending chaos.

By April, 1985 the group was neutralized by the arrest of key members including Ellison. Charges against them included possession of machineguns, silencers, explosives, and the murder of an Arkansas Highway Patrolman. On the group's compound, a bomb factory was found along with explosives, computer equipment, automatic weapons, and 30 gallons of cyanide.

The Order AKA (The Bruders Schweigen)

With connections to the Aryan Nations compound at Hayden Lake, Idaho, The Order was one of the most dangerous domestic terrorist groups to ever operate in the U.S. Considering the Aryan Nations founder, Richard Butler, not aggressive enough, Robert Matthews formed this group in 1983 in Seattle, Washington.⁷

The Order's activities included bank robberies, arson, counterfeiting, armored car robberies, shootouts with the FBI, and the murder of Denver talk show host, Alan Berg.⁸ Their actions and intentions constituted a direct threat to the U.S. Government. They issued a declaration of war in 1984 stating their intent to kill government officials, military personnel, police officers, bankers, and judges. Their most successful action was the July, 1984 robbery of a Brink's truck near Ukiah, California. Three and one half million

dollars were stolen, much of it never recovered. The Order acquired massive amounts of weapons, ammunition, explosives, hand grenades, computers, and electronic equipment. Several of its members have been convicted of murder, bank robbery, and conspiracy to overthrow the U.S. Government. Matthews was traced to Whidbey Island, Washington where he was killed after a 36 hour shootout with the FBI in December, 1984.

The death and imprisonment of several leading members of The Order did not spell the end for them. A splinter group calling itself the Bruders Schweigen Strike Force II arose and continued where The Order left off. By 1986 most of this group had been arrested for robbery, counterfeiting, murder, and arson.⁹ The migration of racists between hostile groups and the advent of parallel organizations shows the persistent nature of the problem.

The White Patriot Party (WPP)

The White Patriot Party evolved from the Carolina Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, and has also been referred to as the east coast division of The Order. Its leader, Frazier Glenn Miller Jr. was arrested in 1987 along with several of his cohorts.¹⁰ Charges against them read similar to those of other arrested Identity members. Threats against the government and minority groups, possession of illegal weapons and explosives, and plans to create a separate, Whites only state in the Southeast United States characterized this group.

Of particular note is this group's possible connection with active duty soldiers. Glenn Miller Jr. retired from the U.S. Army and had long been a member of Army Special Forces units. Federal Court records indicate that this group was able to buy C-4 plastic explosives,

ammunition, Light Anti-Tank Weapons (LAW), hand grenades, and assorted military equipment through an unidentified Military Intelligence officer at Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

The WPP claimed 5,000 members before the arrest of Miller and his cohorts. Law enforcement officials believe that this group has been subdued. However, another organization has stood up in its place. The Southern National Front (SNF) is reported to be the fastest growing White Supremacist organization in America. It has supposedly disavowed the violent image of the WPP and uses propaganda and political activism as its major tools. With its headquarters in Fayetteville, North Carolina, the SNF allegedly has a large number of active duty soldiers in its ranks.

Posse Comitatus

Begun in 1969 in Portland, Oregon, the Posse shares the beliefs of other Identity groups. They have a particular hatred of government tax officials and believe that no government beyond the county level is legitimate.¹¹ Seizing upon the farm crisis of the 1980s, Posse chapters in North Dakota and the rest of the farmbelt recruited members and spread their message of Jewish banker conspiracies which they claimed were controlling America. The Posse heavily ascribes to the notion that the U.S. Government, as well as others, are controlled by an international Jewish organization which is attempting to implement "one world government."¹²

Chapters exist in a number of states with an estimated membership of 100,000 people spread over 1,700 different groups. Weapons training, neo-nazi propaganda, survivalist mentality, and

questionable religious doctrine characterize the Posse. Members have been arrested and convicted for similar crimes as those of other Identity groups. Paramilitary training, weapons violations, murder of law enforcement officers, and threats of insurrection against the U.S. Government are chief among their crimes.

The Posse's most celebrated member, Gordon Kahl, killed two federal agents in North Dakota¹³ and was later located and killed in a shootout with police near Smithville, Arkansas.¹⁴ Kahl and the Posse were linked directly to other hostile groups, and he took refuge with members of the CSA in Arkansas prior to his death.

Ku Klux Klan (KKK)

The Ku Klux Klan was established in 1865 at Pulaski, Tennessee. Originally formed as a social club, it soon began intimidating newly freed Blacks. During the Reconstruction period, thousands of Blacks were killed or otherwise assaulted by Klan members.¹⁵

The Klan currently exists under three major organizations; the United Klans of America, the Invisible Empire, and the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. Their headquarters are located in Tuscaloosa, Alabama; Shelton, Connecticut; and Tuscumbia, Alabama respectively. Under the umbrella of these three organizations, at least 27 different splinter groups exist with a total membership estimated at 5,000 people nationwide.¹⁶ Their basic doctrine advocates White supremacy, anti-Semitism, and their own version of Christian morality.

Klan activities are not confined to cross burning and marches. They engage in propaganda dissemination, paramilitary training, and

murder. Klans exist in nearly every state, not just those of the deep South.

A degree of cooperation is noted between the Klan and other hate groups. The fact that the White Patriot Party evolved from the Klan, and that Posse Comitatus members have attended and assisted Klan rallies demonstrates their collusion.¹⁷

Black Separatists

At the opposite end of the racial spectrum lies several Black separatist groups. Their ideology and rhetoric contains exhortations to violence which are as inflammatory as those of the Identity Movement. Black nationalism, anti-government sentiment, and foreign, Islamic connections are of concern to law enforcement officials in regard to these groups. Discussed below are a few of the many groups in this category.

African Peoples Socialist Party (APSP) African National Reparations Organization (ANRO)

These two organizations are closely aligned and advocate the creation of an "African Liberation Army" in the U.S., the end of taxation of Black people, the release of all Black prisoners, and the withdraw of police forces from Black communities.¹⁸ ANRO, which was started by Stokely Carmichael, the former Black Panther, specifically demands that government reparations be made to atone for the years of exploitation by Whites. Both of these groups are associated with leftist, communist organizations. Their size is unknown, but they have offices in Philadelphia, Oakland, Akron, and St. Petersburg.

Republic of New Africa (RNA)

Claiming five states (South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana) as their homeland, this group emerged in 1968 and quickly got the attention of police forces.¹⁹ Still alive today, this group is closely aligned with leftist organizations and spreads a doctrine of Black revolution and violence against the state. Armed robbery, direct firefights with police officers, murder, weapons and explosives accumulation, and combat training characterize their activities. Both the RNA and the APSP have probable connections to the Afro-Arab Foundation which is believed to be a conduit for Libyan money to U.S. militant groups.²⁰

Black Panther Militia

A holdover from the 1960s Black Panther organization is the Black Panther Militia of Indianapolis, Indiana. According to the 13 October 1994 CNN News broadcast, this group had set a deadline of 1 January 1995 for the satisfaction of their demands--a date which passed without incident. They threatend armed, Black revolt if the government did not meet their demands for increased social spending, reduction of the Black infant mortality rate, and increased jobs for Blacks.

The Militia is reportedly linked to the Nation of Islam, and its spokesman was quoted as saying, "It is better to kill and die than to live enslaved." The size of the group is not known, but its link to Nation of Islam, the largest Black separatist organization, carries the connotation of considerable size.

Capabilities

The racial hate groups discussed above do not appear to have any widespread support among the general population, either White or Black. Their membership remains very low relative to the overall population. Some of the groups, like the KKK, WPP, and Posse, have memberships numbering in the thousands, but there exists only a handful within each group who are committed to the point of conducting direct attacks against the U.S. Government or other criminal acts of extreme violence. The possibility does exist for inter-group cooperation among these few hard core members, particularly in light of the fact that they are linked on a national computer net.²¹

These groups pose a considerable risk to the public and bear careful watching by the police. Considering their demonstrated ability to acquire weapons and explosives, as well as their small unit military skills, they are capable of inflicting serious harm at the local level. Direct action raids, ambushes, assassinations, bombings, and other terrorist type acts are definitely within their means. With an ability to communicate with subordinate groups located in multiple states, their organizations have the ability to strike targets simultaneously across the nation and create a tremendous degree of confusion and panic. The limitation to concerted action is as stated above--committed members willing to go beyond talk to action.

Religion Based Extremism

The groups discussed above are primarily disaffected from mainstream society for reasons of race. Race, however, is not their only motivation as was seen in their misguided appeal to religious

values. Other groups who pose a potential threat to U.S. society are based primarily on religious hostility or on issues with religious foundations.

Operation Rescue

Taking their moral authority from the Bible, Operation Rescue members fervently believe in the righteousness of their cause. They claim that they ". . . are dedicated to saving the lives of pre-born children."²² Their efforts to shut down abortion clinics, or at least to disrupt them for a day, saves the lives of "innocent blood."

Operation Rescue espouses absolute non-violence, but extremists within the group have become carried away in their zeal. Since 1993, five people have been murdered by the zealots and others wounded in shootings. Clinics have been bombed, and a splinter group within the organization claims the moral authority to kill on behalf of the unborn.²³ The violence has prompted federal agents to increase surveillance of Operation Rescue members and to provide security at abortion clinics targeted for protest. Canada has recently experienced an abortion related shooting²⁴ even though guns are tightly controlled in that country.

The resort to murder has alienated a large part of Operation Rescue's supporters. Main stream churches and Christian supporters are beginning to distance themselves from this group. The cohesion of their support base remains to be seen.

Nation of Islam

Islamic faith has found a receptive audience in parts of Black American society. Louis Farrakhan and his Nation of Islam stand as the most prominent of Black Muslim groups. Inflammatory speech is characteristic of this group, although ample evidence exists which implicates them in numerous acts of violence. Farrakhan has threatened to raise an army of Black men and women, and he has predicted a race war in the United States.²⁵ He further states that Black street gangs will play a leading role in his prophecy of racial conflict. He claims that Blacks will inherit the "promised land." The Nation of Islam claims religious status which gives a sense of respectability to them. Despite their religious doctrine and belief in moral purity, they are linked to some of the most violent, Black street gangs such as the infamous El-Rukn gang which is based in Chicago.

Much like their White racist counterparts, they recruit heavily in the nation's prisons. Black inmates are often forcibly recruited by Nation of Islam members and are involved in similar activities to those of their White antagonists. In and out of prison they advocate political assassination, violence of all kinds, and the use of narcotics trafficking to finance their enterprises.

They have publicly allied themselves with other revolutionary groups, as well as with foreign powers hostile toward the United States. They have issued joint statements with the American Indian Movement advocating the recapture of America from White Europeans.²⁶ Muammar Qaddafi openly provides financial and moral support to the Nation of Islam, and he encourages them to initiate a race war within this nation.

Nation of Islam members have attended revolutionary conferences in Libya where representatives of numerous nations and organizations which violently oppose the United States have participated. Related organizations in the U.S. include the Afro-Arab Foundation, the All African People's Revolutionary Party, the Republic of New Africa, and the People's Association for Human Rights. All promote violent, Black separatism and the creation of an all Black nation in America.

The Middle East Connection

As noted above the Nation of Islam has ties to the Afro-Arab Foundation and to Muammar Qaddafi. Mid-East terrorists and Islamic dominated governments would obviously like to damage American society in whatever way possible.

In addition to supporting Black Muslims, Mid-East organizations carry out other operations in the United States. According to Oliver Revelle, a former FBI head of counterterrorism, a good deal of money is raised here in the United States by tax exempt organizations who then funnel the money to Islamic terrorist groups like Hamas.²⁷ Three groups were cited by Revelle; the United Holy Land Fund of Chicago, the Holy Land Foundation of Richardson, Texas, and the Islamic Association for Palestine, also of Richardson, Texas. A recent PBS documentary called "Jihad in America" alleges that more than thirty such organizations are alive in the U.S. In addition to raising funds, they produce anti-Israeli videos and conduct terrorist seminars in Midwest cities of America.

Radical Arab support networks were also revealed in recent news articles. Two Palestinian brothers, Saif Nijmeh of St. Louis and Louie

Nijmeh of Dayton, pleaded guilty to federal racketeering charges for their role in support of the Abu-Nidal organization.²⁸ The brothers, along with Tawfiq Musa of Milwaukee, were couriers of money and information to Mid-East terrorists.

Capability

Religious-oriented extremists are capable of a range of actions depending upon the group in question. Antiabortion zealots are limited by their lack of numerical strength. Their actions will most likely remain at the low end of organization--murder, bombings, and arson committed by zealots within the ranks. Conversely, the Nation of Islam has a significant population. With the number of Black American Muslims estimated as high as five million, Nation of Islam has a large pond in which to fish. However, no firm numbers are available regarding membership in Nation of Islam. They have the resources in terms of people, money, organization, outside support, arms, and commitment to carry out large scale violence in American cities. Their links to street gangs and international terrorist organizations make them particularly dangerous. They have the capacity to carry out operations ranging from assassinations and bombings to direct, armed confrontation with police and military units.

Criminal Gangs

Criminal gangs are not normally thought of in terms of insurgency, insurrection, or internal warfare. A closer look at them does reveal strong similarities to insurgent or terrorist groups. In his study, "A Military Campaign Against Gangs," David R. Hogg

categorizes urban street gangs as a "preservationist type"²⁹ insurgency. Although they do not seek political change, they do conduct attacks against non-ruling groups and authorities. Violent conflict with ruling authority, however, is inevitable, and does occur in the course of their "normal" activities.

Writing for the U.S. Army Strategic Studies Institute, Steven Metz claims that insurgency will persist, but will evolve into two basic forms--spiritual and commercial.³⁰ The commercial type relates to urban street gangs. Members are discontented with life and attach an inordinate meaning and significance to material wealth and possessions.

Even though street gangs are not interested in political power, they do pose a threat to the nation. Their very existence and continual flaunting of the law reduces the credibility of government. Street gangs operate in every major city in America as well as many smaller cities and towns. Their membership is estimated in the hundreds of thousands.³¹ News of drive-by shootings, revenge murders, and organized violence from street gangs appears daily in the American press. Their actions, especially in light of the quantity and sophistication of weapons they possess,³² cannot be ignored by the government. Peterson points out that in 1991, 1,554 people were murdered by gunfire in Los Angeles county and one third of these involved gang members.

Capability

Urban street gangs have the potential to create havoc in their environment. They possess a great number of members who are willing and able to commit extreme violence. With a modicum of training and small unit discipline they could conduct a variety of actions to include raid,

ambush, deliberate attack, and defense of urban terrain. Their primary motivation being money, they are not inclined to direct conflict with the state. Because of this their actions are confined to those that they think will advance their financial interests or power position of their particular gang. Murder, arson, extortion, and miscellaneous violence directed at rivals will likely be the limit of their acts unless they grow to such an extent that they feel capable of challenging government forces.

Government Opposition Groups

Hostile groups must have an enemy, whether that be another race, religious group or criminal competitor. All of these groups oppose the U.S. Government to some degree. The discussion below concerns groups which specifically target the U.S. Government as the recipient of their animosity.

American Justice Federation

The chairman of this group is an Indianapolis lawyer, Linda Thompson, who speaks out in a video entitled "America Under Siege" against the "criminals and thieves" who now run the country.³³ She claims that the United States Government is engaged in a conspiracy to subdue the American people and place them under the rule of a United Nations system of "one world government." She cites the 1992 Randy Weaver incident in Idaho, during which an FBI sniper killed Weaver's wife, and the 1993 Waco, Texas raids by the FBI and the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms as examples of a repressive, brutal, and fascist government which has gotten out of control. She

asserts that the federal government is using clandestine organizations as tools for the "takeover."

She says that Special Operations Forces flying ominous "black helicopters" are training to insert teams into U.S. cities, cut off the population by destroying bridges and then forcibly subdue the people. She claims that these black helicopters are actually being used to conduct violent raids on the homes of "patriots," which she defines as anyone who opposes this government conspiracy. During these raids, homes are fired upon, and commandos forcibly enter and kill or capture the inhabitants. She claims that liberal media collusion prevents the dissemination of this information to the public.

She further makes a case that the U.S. is recruiting foreign mercenaries under United Nations auspices who are training at military installations and secret camps. Their purpose is to dominate the United States and impose "one world government." The Joint Readiness Training Center at Fort Polk, Louisiana is repeatedly noted as a major UN training site.

Allegedly the U.S. Military actively supports these moves and is indoctrinating soldiers into one world obedience. She claims that the following quotes are taken from military documents and are used to indoctrinate or to assess soldiers for particular assignments which will further the goals of the one world takeover.

I am a United Nations fighting person. I serve in the forces which promote world peace and every nation's way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defense. I would fire upon a U.S. citizen who refuses or resists confiscation of firearms banned by the U.S. Government.³⁴

Mrs. Thompson uses quotes from Field Manuals 100-19, Domestic Support Operations, and 41-30 Civil Affairs to assail the increased cooperation between law enforcement agencies, federal agencies, and the military to combat crime in America. According to her, the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms (BATF), and the U.S. Military are all controlled by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) under the Garden Plot civil disturbance plan. Garden Plot, she claims, is actually a plan for the final subjugation of the American people and the imprisonment of the remaining "patriots" who resist occupation.

The Militia/Patriots

Mrs. Thompson voices the fears of many Americans who anticipate the "one world takeover." This study can show no direct link to the American Justice Federation, but across America there are groups who ascribe to her views and who have armed themselves in preparation for action. They classify themselves as "citizen militias" or "patriots," and they conduct paramilitary training.³⁵

It is estimated that up to 10,000 people have joined armed militias who operate in 30 states. Militia rhetoric shares a lot of common ground with racial hate groups--doomsday prospects of a national takeover, a call to arms, the need for survival and paramilitary training, hoarding of food, and resistance to the "new world order."

Capability

Small unit action at the local level, such as squad size ambushes, and raids, are within the capability of militia groups. It is

probable that very few of their members are physically or technically competent to conduct serious operations, although they are armed with modern weapons. Militia groups are rural in their focus and are psychologically geared toward defense against "government oppression." The possibility does exist that some of the more competent and determined members might take violent action against government targets.

The propaganda effect of these groups poses a real danger. By appealing to common themes of conspiracy, oppression, and persecution by the U.S. Government they serve as a catalyst for social discontent. The prospect of militia members "graduating" from this level of disaffection and going on to more violent levels of frustration is strong.

In conclusion, there are a plethora of hostile groups in the United States, each of which is disaffected from mainstream society for a number of reasons. Primarily, they are aggravated over issues or ideologies which fall under the four categories of race, religion, criminal gain, or opposition to the U.S. Government. This is not to say that there are clean dividing lines which define the positions of these groups. A good measure of similarity exists among them, excluding the criminal gangs, in terms of their basic beliefs, attitudes, and rhetoric. In addition to their hostility, they are very well armed and hold the capability to inflict serious violence on society. To this point, however, they are constrained by the lack of members willing to commit wholesale violence, and by the general public's lack of support.

Endnotes

¹Ryan Quade Emerson, U.S. Terrorists Radicals Revolutionaries (Bethesda: Interests Ltd., 1987), 1-4.

²Anti Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Hate Groups in America a Record of Bigotry and Violence (New York: ADL, 1988), 42. (hereafter cited as ADL)

³ADL, 41.

⁴James Ridgeway, Blood in the Face (New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 1991), 91.

⁵Emerson, 7.

⁶Ibid., 10-11.

⁷Ibid., 13.

⁸Ridgeway, 89-100.

⁹Emerson, 34.

¹⁰Ibid., 14-15.

¹¹Ridgeway, 109-141.

¹²James Corcoran, Bitter Harvest (New York: Viking Press, 1990), 27-42.

¹³Ibid., 96-100.

¹⁴Ibid., 238-246.

¹⁵ADL, 75-76.

¹⁶Emerson, 47.

¹⁷Ibid., 20.

¹⁸Ibid., 128.

¹⁹Ibid., 147-148.

²⁰Ibid., 129.

²¹Emerson, 6.

²²Gary Leber, "We Must Rescue Them," Hastings Center Report, 19 (November/December 1989): 26.

²³"Acts of violence cripple group fighting abortion," Kansas City Star, 11 August 1994: A-1.

²⁴"Canada hunts for attacker who shot abortion doctor," Kansas City Star, 10 November 1994: A-2.

²⁵Emerson, 175-176.

²⁶Emerson, 178.

²⁷Oliver Revelle, interviewed by Ben Kinchlow on Christian Broadcast News, 23 November 1994.

²⁸"Terrorist net reaches into the Heartland," Kansas City Star, 22 August 1994: A-1.

²⁹David R. Hogg, "A Military Campaign Against Gangs," (Monograph, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1993), 25.

³⁰Steven Metz, The Future of Insurgency (Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 1993), 2-16.

³¹Hogg, 26.

³²Steven W. Peterson, "Civil Disturbance in the American Urban Environment: An Evaluation of U.S. Army Doctrine," (MMAS Thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1993), 43-46.

³³Linda D. Thompson, "America Under Siege," Video produced by the American Justice Federation: Indianapolis, Indiana 1994.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Christopher John Farley, "Patriot Games," Time, (December 19, 1994): 48-49.

CHAPTER 4

GOVERNMENT TOOLS

Governments, local, state, or national, have a variety of tools available to use in response to outbreaks of violence. The tools that will be examined in this chapter are government enforcement assets, public law, and military doctrine. This chapter will discuss not only the assets available, but also the coordination required to put them in motion. A look at current U.S. law concerning the restrictions on, and freedoms of, federal military forces to combat internal enemies will follow. A review of military doctrine related to internal conflict and domestic enemies will precede the final section of this chapter which looks at the State of California and the City of Los Angeles to determine their capability to combat an organized and armed threat.

Government Assets

The use of federal military force to suppress a domestic conflict of any type is the exception and not the rule.¹ Only after local and state assets are exhausted or overwhelmed are federal military forces used.² The idea of military intervention in domestic conflict is repugnant to the American people and must remain a last resort option. Accordingly, requests for such action must originate at the bottom of the government hierarchy and flow to the top.

In the event of violent acts, the public's first line of defense is always the local police and/or sheriff's department. When a situation becomes unmanageable for forces on the scene, the senior police official present must request additional support. City and county government officials determine, based on their estimate of the situation, the need for additional police forces. No clear cut threshold exists for the escalation of police presence for any given situation. Subjective judgement based on experience and the anticipated consequences of non-action must apply to this process.

Given a situation where city and county police forces are inadequate, the Mayor has the option of appealing to the State Governor for assistance. The Governor will usually declare a state of emergency. The commitment of state police assets and call-up of the State National Guard usually follows. The State Response Plan is ordered, in effect, by the Governor. Most, if not all, states have a plan for civil disturbances and/or natural disasters. The plan is managed by the Office of Emergency Services, or some similarly named organization, which coordinates and serves as a central control center for such situations.

The National Guard remains under the control of the State Governor unless conditions deteriorate to the point where federal assistance is required. Again judgement of senior civilian officials determine this point. The Governor must petition the President directly for federal assistance.³ When it's determined that state and National Guard resources need to be supplemented, the National Command Authority

will direct the army to assist the state.⁴ State National Guard forces may then be federalized at the President's option under 10 U.S.C. A331.

The U.S. Army has a role in restoring law and order when local and state law enforcement agencies and National Guard assets are unable to quell the disturbance. Once the President has ordered federal assistance for a particular state, he can deploy federal law enforcement assets, military forces, or a wide variety of government resources. If his decision is to deploy military force to subdue a conflict, the President will take two steps. First he will issue a proclamation directing "that all persons engaged in unlawful obstructions to justice cease and desist, disperse, and retire peaceably."⁵ He will then issue an executive order directing the use of federal military forces.

Federal law enforcement assets include those under the Department of Justice, which are the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), and the U.S. Marshals. The Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms (BATF) is included under the Department of Treasury, and the Department of Transportation controls the U.S. Coast Guard as it applies to law enforcement.

Federal military assets include units from all services and of all types. The normal type unit used, however, is a maneuver brigade as well as Military Police units. The composition of military forces, their missions, and capabilities are discussed in some depth below under military doctrine.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is the executive agent for implementing federal assistance to a state and its local governments.⁶ In this role, FEMA coordinates the efforts of all federal

agencies. They are primarily concerned with disaster or environmental assistance. However, they can play a role in any type of domestic support operation. They provide coordination with agencies such as the General Services Administration, and the Departments of Health and Human Services, Justice, Interior, Transportation, Treasury, and Labor.

A very specific line of authority exists where federal forces are deployed for civil disturbance operations. The principle of civilian authority over civil disturbance operations remains constant. In accordance with Department of Defense (DOD) Directive 3025.12, the Secretary of the Army is the executive agent for DOD civil disturbance actions.⁷ The Secretary of the Army (SA) appoints the Director of Military Support (DOMS), usually a general officer, who serves as the action agent for the SA. The DOMS plans for, coordinates, and directs the employment of federal military resources and is the DOD point of contact. The SA tasks appropriate unified commanders to provide forces to the designated Joint Task Force (JTF) Headquarters. The supported Commander in Chief (CINC) is referred to as the operating agent. The CINC's of Atlantic Command, Forces Command, and Pacific Command (CINCLANT, CINCFOR, and CINCPAC respectively) are designated by the DOD Civil Disturbance Plan, Garden Plot, as possible operating agents for civil disturbance operations. It must be noted that the commander of Forces Command is no longer a CINC, but this study will refer to him as such for the sake of consistency with Garden Plot.

Parallel to the military chain of command is a civilian line of authority. This line runs from the President through the Attorney General to subordinate civil authorities. The Attorney General

coordinates and manages all requests for federal assistance in civil disturbance cases.⁸ The Attorney General appoints a Senior Civilian Representative of the Attorney General (SCRAG) who is responsible for coordinating federal civil disturbance operations and assistance to state civil authorities. The SCRAG has the authority to assign missions to deployed federal military forces in coordination with the commander of those forces. The JTF commander has operational control over his forces, and at no time will active military forces below the JTF commander, to include federalized National Guard units, accept taskings or missions directly from law enforcement or civilian officials.⁹

U.S. Law

As discussed above, provisions exist for the use of federal military forces in civil disturbance operations. The common understanding of their role, however, is that it is very limited and restrictive in nature. The fact is that the Constitution and public law provide the President with a high degree of latitude in the use of federal troops in domestic operations; however, specific preconditions must exist to justify their use. The following few paragraphs will summarize first, restrictions on their use, and second, permissible employment.

The most frequently cited law in reference to the military and law enforcement is the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878. The current version in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 1385 reads:

Whoever, except in cases and under circumstances expressly authorized by the Constitution or act of Congress, willfully uses any part of the Army or Air Force as a posse comitatus or otherwise to execute the laws shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.¹⁰

As a result of this act military personnel may not participate directly in:

1. interdiction of a vehicle, vessel, aircraft, or other similar activity;
2. search and seizure;
3. arrest, stop and frisk, or similar activity;
4. surveillance or pursuit of individuals, or as informants, undercover agents, investigators, or interrogators.

The Posse Comitatus Act and the above restrictions do not apply to the National Guard when not in federal service, reserve components when not on active duty or active duty for training. They also do not apply to DOD civilians or active duty soldiers serving in a private capacity when in an off duty status.

The Posse Comitatus Act, on the surface, appears to stifle all use of active military forces to deal with law enforcement problems. There are, however, three exceptions to the act as well as direct constitutional authority of the Congress to suppress insurrection and protect the states from domestic violence.

The Constitution has two provisions which allow for the use of federal forces to quell insurrections or domestic violence in a state. The first is article I, section 8, paragraph 15¹¹ which says that the Congress has the power "to provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;" The second provision in the Constitution is found in article IV section 4.¹² It states that:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them

against Invasion; and on application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.

Specific exceptions to the Posse Comitatus Act which allow active duty military forces to respond to civil disturbances fall under three categories. They are: (1) request from a state, (2) enforcement of federal law, and (3) protection of civil rights.

As discussed above, a Governor or State Legislature may request federal military assistance from the President if the resources available to that state are exhausted. In accordance with 10 U.S.C.

A331:

Whenever there is an insurrection in any State against its government, the President may, upon the request of its legislature or of its governor if the legislature cannot be convened, call into Federal service such of the militia of other States, in the number requested by that State, and use such of the armed forces, as he considers necessary to suppress the insurrection.¹³

In addition to protection of the states, public law also provides for the enforcement of federal law within individual states.

10 U.S.C. A332 states that:

Whenever the President considers that unlawful obstructions, combinations, or assemblages, or rebellion against the authority of the United States, make it impracticable to enforce the laws of the United States in any State or Territory by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, he may call into Federal service such of the militia of any State, and use such of the armed forces, as he considers necessary to enforce those laws or to suppress the rebellion.¹⁴

The third exception to Posse Comitatus concerns protection of the civil rights of citizens within a particular state. 10 U.S.C. A333 declares:

The President, by using the militia or the armed forces, or both, or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, if it

so hinders the laws of that State, and of the United States within the State, that any part or class of its people is deprived of a right, privilege, immunity, or protection named in the Constitution and secured by law, and the constituted authorities of that State are unable, fail, or refuse to protect that right, privilege, or immunity, or to give that protection¹⁵

These three exceptions allow for the direct application of federal military force to suppress rebellions, insurrections, insurgencies, and any type of conflict which threatens the order of society or sovereignty of constituted government. In addition to direct force, other forms of federal assistance are acceptable under current law.

The military is authorized under 10 U.S.C. 371-380 to provide limited support to civilian law enforcement agencies indirectly by sharing information, equipment, facilities, and other services.¹⁶ The loan of equipment and training are commonly done in the effort to combat drug trafficking. In addition, under the Immigration and Naturalization Act, the direct operation of equipment by active military personnel is permitted.

The most sensitive type of indirect assistance is the collection of information by active duty military intelligence soldiers against U.S. citizens. Intelligence collection against United States persons, which means citizens who are not affiliated with the Department of Defense in any way, is governed by DOD Directive 5240. 1-R, Army Regulations 190-45, 380-13, 381-10, and Executive Order 12333.

Garden Plot incorporates their provisions, and it states that the Department of Justice is the lead agency for civil disturbance intelligence/information collection. The FBI is charged as the lead agency in this arena.¹⁷ The Army can only collect on U.S. persons if a

threat exists to DOD personnel, facilities, operations, or official visitors. In all cases the least intrusive means of collection will be used. Field Manual 100-19, Domestic Support Operations, says that civilian law enforcement agencies can request the support of military intelligence personnel, however, that support must be approved by the SA and coordinated through the Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence. A very specific and limited mission statement must be formulated and coordinated through proper authorities, to include stringent legal review. If approved, military intelligence personnel can collect, analyze, and disseminate information to disaster relief personnel or emergency operations centers, and they can support emergency operations centers through the use of Intelligence Preparation of the Battlefield. In accordance with FM 100-19, information gathered is not considered "collected" unless it is filed, stored, or retained for later use by the military. In all cases, the "information that military intelligence personnel gather without using or retaining it is considered not to have been collected."¹⁸

Military Doctrine

The above discussion highlights the fact that the President has force options available which he can use to suppress domestic conflicts or insurgencies as well as to defeat any internal war threat. This section discusses current military doctrine for domestic support operations and civil disturbance.

Field Manual 100-19, Domestic Support Operations, covers the gamut of federal military assistance to state and local governments. It

defines domestic support as "the authorized use of army physical and human resources to support domestic requirements."¹⁹

Four categories of assistance are specifically addressed by FM 100-19. They are disaster assistance, environmental assistance, law enforcement support, and community assistance. Support to law enforcement entails counterdrug operations, civil disturbance operations, special security operations, combatting terrorism, explosive ordnance disposal, and similar activities.²⁰ This publication illustrates a new awareness of the benefits of military assistance to improve the physical and social infrastructure.

The focus of this study is on military support to law enforcement, specifically as it relates to internal conflict, insurgency, or warfare. Much of FM 100-19, associated with these topics, has already been discussed above. The manual covers roles and responsibilities of key players/decision makers, legal considerations, and categories of support. A key point made is that the Chief, National Guard Bureau is the executive agent for planning and coordinating execution of military support operations.²¹ This emphasizes the principle of federal force being the last resort.

In chapter seven, "Missions in Support of Law Enforcement," three categories of support are emphasized. They are counterdrug, civil disturbance, and terrorism operations. Civil disturbance has been covered above, but the other categories merit some discussion, since they relate to the topic of this study.

The Army provides support for counterdrug operations but does not take a leading role. There are, however, significant contributions

made by the Army to this effort.²² U.S. Army soldiers can and do engage in detection and monitoring operations. The DOD is the lead agency for detection and monitoring of air, sea and ground transit of illegal drugs bound for the United States. The arrest and seizure of people and property, however, rests with civilian law enforcement officials.

The Army also gives counterdrug support by providing manpower, training, equipment, and transportation to civilian law enforcement agencies. Military Intelligence (MI) soldiers provide Intelligence Preparation of the Battlefield (IPB), training, linguist support, imagery support, and analysis, as well as information processing and analysis. They also perform land reconnaissance functions through the use of aircraft, unmanned aerial vehicles, listening and observation posts, radars, night vision and thermal imagery devices, and remote sensors. All collected information must be surrendered to civilian authorities with no retention by military units.

The FBI has the leading role in combatting terrorism. The Army's role is force protection and vulnerability reduction for DOD people and property.²³ Army support takes the form of providing material, facilities, and advisory personnel to the FBI and other law enforcement agencies. Additionally, CINCFOR is the executive agent for advice and training to protect key assets in the United States, such as communications nodes, power plants, and critical national defense plants. These functions fall within the DOD Key Asset Protection Plan (DODKAPP).

The application of military force in the domestic environment is the focus of the DOD Civil Disturbance Plan, Garden Plot. Garden Plot

encompasses the full spectrum of violence from individual acts of terrorism to riots, and full scale insurrection.²⁴ Its intent is to deal with any level of domestic threat, and it recognizes the diversity of motivations and capabilities of potential adversaries.

Garden Plot, being a DOD level Operations Plan (OPLAN), is very generic in nature. It provides task organization, concept of operations, force requirements, and tactics and techniques. The mission statement for Garden Plot reads as follows:

When directed by the President, designated federal military forces conduct civil disturbance operations, through appropriate military commanders, within, the fifty states, District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, United States Possessions, and United States Territories or any political subdivision thereof, to assist civil authorities in the restoration of law and order.²⁵

Annex A of Garden Plot covers task organization and force requirements. The CINCFOR will designate one brigade size JTF headquarters for each active Continental U.S. (CONUS) based corps. Each JTF so designated must be capable of commanding and controlling (C2) two or more brigades.²⁶ The personnel strength of each brigade will be at least 1,210 soldiers, but not more than 2,150 soldiers. In addition to CINCFOR, CINCLANT, and CINCPAC are also tasked to designate a JTF Headquarters each for C2 of a brigade size JTF for operations in their respective areas of responsibility.

Minimum force requirements are specified in Garden Plot. It calls for one brigade per CONUS based division; six battalions for assignment to the Military District of Washington (MDW); a Quick Reaction Force (QRF) consisting of a JTF Headquarters and one brigade to remain on 24 hour alert status; one Marine company for defense of the U.S. Capitol Building; and two Marine battalions for the MDW.²⁷ The

Commander MDW will maintain a JTF capable of C2 for two brigades and will be prepared to accept augmentation of additional brigades. Under current U.S. Army force structure that translates to three JTF Headquarters and eight brigades designated for civil disturbance operations, not counting the forces designated for MDW.

Annex C of Garden Plot describes the concept of operations. The level of command involved with this OPLAN necessitates it being very general in nature. This annex describes the probable order of employment of available forces and general tasks of unified commands from alert to deployment, and redeployment. It specifies that minimum force is to be used in all operations, and it spells out the conditions under which deadly force may be used. Briefly stated, they are that lesser means have been exhausted and the risk to innocent bystanders is not increased by its use. Deadly force must then only be used to protect lives, prevent crimes which threaten lives, protect key facilities and services which are essential to public health, and in self defense.²⁸

Specific tactics and techniques are as generic as are concepts of operation.²⁹ Those discussed in Garden Plot are on an increasing continuum of force beginning with a public proclamation of the intent to use force. Shows of force and use of riot control formations are discussed as well as the use of pressurized water and riot control agents. Weapons fire is reserved for the upper end of the scale. Fire by selected marksmen, response to sniper fire and full firepower are options available to the JTF Commander provided that justification exists as discussed above.

Garden Plot specifies that all units designated for civil disturbance operations will be trained, equipped, and maintained for rapid deployment. Infantry and Military Police (MP) units will train for civil defense and be prepared to receive special equipment (helmets, shields, etc). They additionally are to be prepared to initiate more intense training on short notice.³⁰ The standard specified by which units will train is Field Manual 19-15, Civil Disturbance Operations.

FM 19-15 covers a lot of ground. It deals with causes of disturbances, crowd behavior and tactics, and JTF organization and options for response to violence. Our concern here is on organization and response options.

The JTF organization described in FM 19-15 has two major elements--a control element and an action element.³¹ The control element consists of a command group which is comprised of military and civilian government officials. A crisis management team is also part of the control element. It is comprised of military and civilian staff members. It is clear that domestic civil disturbance operations are not only joint in the military sense, but also they are joint efforts among military and civilian organizations.

The action element of the JTF has a threat management force which has three sub-elements. They are a control force, a negotiation team, and a special reaction team (SRT). The SRT is of particular concern. It is a five man assault element similar to a police special weapons assault team (SWAT). It stands as the final force option for dealing with snipers and hostage rescue situations. Military SRT assets

are only to be used if civilian teams are not available, but their use is not ruled out.

Control force operations are addressed in chapter six. The control force which is the conventional troop force of the JTF is the primary tool of the JTF Commander. The operations specified in chapter six deal mainly with crowd control functions with only cursory regard for what it terms "special threats." These threats are snipers, hostage takers, arsonists, and bombers. They receive only five pages of coverage. Force is clearly a last resort option and when used it must be minimized.

Entire chapters of FM 19-15 are devoted to crowd control formations, riot control agents, and the use of riot batons. Chapter eleven is entitled extreme force options. It gives only a quick description of types of weapons to be used. The Ring Airfoil System, shotguns, rifles, and machineguns are quickly covered as tools for extreme force. No tactics, techniques or procedures for dealing with a paramilitary threat are given. The focus clearly lies with crowd control and conventional riot procedures.

The latest example of military force and civil disturbance is the 1992, Los Angeles riots. Both active duty soldiers and those of the California National Guard described their experiences in Los Angeles as more like urban warfare than riot control.³² While the situation was handled very successfully, it could have been much different given an organized threat such as those described in chapter 3 of this study. It appears that the military units deployed to Los Angeles improvised in the absence of any doctrine which addressed their particular situation.

Doctrine is needed which blends civil disturbance operations with military operations in urban terrain.

The Army's doctrinal publication for urban warfare is Field Manual 90-10, Military Operations in Urbanized Terrain (MOUT).

Scenarios are given in this publication which indicate that a force ratio of 3:1 is required to overcome a defender in urban terrain. Field Manual 34-130, Intelligence Preparation of the Battlefield (IPB) gives the same 3:1 ratio for an attack against a prepared position. Both of these documents assume conventional warfare against a foreign enemy. Even with that assumption, FM 90-10 talks of constraints on firepower to insure minimum collateral damage, the inhibiting nature of civilians on the battlefield, and the restrictions they place on the commander's options.³³ The impact on operations in the United States would be more than just restrictive. The spectacle of military forces engaged in direct combat with an insurgent group would receive intense scrutiny by the public as well as by government officials. There would be no room for mistakes or even the perception of excessive force.

An historical example of urban warfare and force ratio is the 1944 Warsaw Ghetto uprising by Polish Jews against the German Army. In that case approximately 2,500 pitifully armed civilians fought for 63 days against overwhelming odds and unrestrained firepower.³⁴ The end result was fatal to the defenders, but they inflicted over 10,000 kills upon their attackers.³⁵ The Germans enjoyed a force ratio advantage of approximately 8.5:1, in addition to their unrestrained use of tanks, artillery, and aircraft. A more recent example was the November, 1985 seizure of the Colombian Palace of Justice by 41 MI-19 insurgents.³⁶

These 41 insurgents withstood a 27 hour attack by over 2,000 Colombian Army troops who used no restraint on weapons or firepower. Over 100 people died in the incident, to include all of the insurgents and 17 Justices of the Colombian Supreme Court. Considering these examples, it might be prudent to heed the advice given in FM 34-130 in regard to force ratios, ". . . avoid letting wishful thinking cloud your judgment."³⁷ In light of the above historical examples, it appears that U.S. Army doctrine for MOUT is a bit clouded.

Using an estimated force ratio requirement of 8:1 for a successful attack against an insurgent group in urban terrain, it can be shown that a relatively small force can match the strength of a large police department and a national guard division. The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) has approximately 6,000 officers. Only a few of them are trained or equipped for urban combat. The LAPD Metro Division has a SWAT team of 40 men, and each of the other eighteen divisions of the department has a seventeen member squad trained in "mobile field force tactics."³⁸ The department also has an anti-terrorist division whose size and composition they will not disclose. From this information, it can be reasonably estimated that about 400 LAPD officers are trained to do assault missions in the urban environment.

The 40th Infantry Division of the California National Guard has 14,132 soldiers assigned. Of this number, 5,500 are actual combat troops who could reasonably be expected to attack a defending enemy, even though the Division does not train its soldiers to combat a paramilitary threat in an urban environment.³⁹ Taken together with the LAPD, there are about 6,000 shooters available for an urban conflict

involving an insurgent group or an internal war or insurgent threat as defined in chapter 1. Dividing this number by a factor of eight, yields 750 as the size of insurgent force which could neutralize the LAPD and the 40th Infantry Division. Applying the same factor to OPLAN Garden Plot, each of the brigades tasked for civil disturbance missions could be matched by 268 armed insurgents. This scenario assumes quite a lot. It chiefly assumes that conditions would foster such determination and participation by an armed group. Although this is an extreme example, it does provoke some thought and gives incentive to maintain the social order described in chapter 2.

In summary, the U.S. Government has many tools available for use in domestic conflict. The government possesses various assets to combat internal threats and has adequate laws to address the issue of military force in domestic conflict. The weaknesses which this study finds is in military doctrine and training. Field Manuals 19-15 Civil Disturbances and 100-19 Domestic Support Operations should address domestic, insurgency and internal warfare in some detail. Particular emphasis should be given to tactics, techniques, and procedures, civilian casualties, collateral damage, and press relations. Additionally, Field Manual 90-10, Military Operations in Urbanized Terrain (MOUT) should be revised to reflect more realistic force ratio scenarios, and MOUT should be incorporated into the doctrine for civil disturbance.

Endnotes

¹U.S. Army, FM 100-19. Domestic Support Operations (Washington: Department of the Army, 1993), 2-9 thru 2-11.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., 2-10.

⁴Ibid., 1-5.

⁵U.S. Army, DOD Civil Disturbance Plan. Garden Plot (Washington: Department of the Army, 1991), C-3. (cited hereafter as Garden Plot)

⁶FM 100-19, 2-3 thru 2-4.

⁷Garden Plot, 1-2.

⁸FM 100-19, 7-12.

⁹Ibid., 7-14.

¹⁰Ibid., 3-1.

¹¹William B. Lockhart, Yale Kamisar, and Jesse H. Choper, The American Constitution: Cases-Comments-Questions (ST. Paul: West Publishing Company, 1975), B-17.

¹²Ibid., B-21.

¹³U.S. Army, Operational Law Handbook (Charlottesville: The Judge Advocate General School, 1994), S-1.

¹⁴Ibid., S-1.

¹⁵Ibid., S-2.

¹⁶FM 100-19, 3-2.

¹⁷Garden Plot, B1-B3.

¹⁸FM 100-19, 3-5.

¹⁹Ibid., 1-1.

²⁰Ibid., 1-2, 1-3.

²¹Ibid., 2-8.

²²Ibid., 7-2 thru 7-9.

²³Ibid., 7-14 thru 7-15.

²⁴Garden Plot, 2.

²⁵Ibid., 4.

²⁶Ibid., A2-A3.

²⁷Ibid., A4.

²⁸Ibid., C-1-7.

²⁹Ibid., C-8-4 thru C-8-7.

³⁰Ibid., A2.

³¹U.S. Army, FM 19-15. Civil Disturbances (Washington: Department of the Army, 1985), 3-6 thru 3-9.

³²Major General (Ret) James D. Delk, "Military Assistance in Los Angeles," Military Review, (September 1992): 18.

³³U.S. Army, FM 90-10. Military Operations in Urbanized Terrain (MOUT) (Washington: Department of the Army, 1979), 1-10.

³⁴J. K. Zawodny, Nothing but Honour (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978), 26.

³⁵Ibid., 210.

³⁶Ana Carrigan, The Palace of Justice (New York: Four Walls Eight Windows, 1993), 89-233.

³⁷U.S. Army, FM 34-130. Intelligence Preparation of the Battlefield (Washington: Department of the Army, 1994), B38.

³⁸Lieutenant Monroe Mabon, Los Angeles Police Department, interviewed by author, 18 December 1994, phonecon.

³⁹Captain Keith Lochner, Assistant G-3, 40ID, interviewed by author, 16 December 1994, phonecon and fax transmission.

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The previous chapters identified a number of conditions which can either lend themselves to social cohesion or conflict. These conditions are social, political, economic, historical, and environmental in nature. As shown, the United States either enjoys or suffers the effects of these conditions. Chapter 2 of this study found that the most seriously divisive issues in American society are in the areas of race/ethnicity, religion, and criminal activity. This chapter will analyze these three issues as they apply to the United States. Additionally, it will look at the internal threat to America and analyze its ability to exploit these divisive issues. Finally, the analysis will turn to the government's ability to cope with the threat by examining past performance.

America--Ready for Revolt?

The fact that the U.S. historically and presently harbors a large degree of racial and ethnic animosity among its people can not be denied. Although the U.S. has succeeded to this point as a multiracial society, symptoms of discord are evident. Among the symptoms are the poor social and economic status of some ethnic minority groups. Affirmative action programs and resistance to them testify to the irritation felt by and among ethnic and racial groups. The move toward

multiculturalism, multilingualism, and the cult of ethnicity discussed in chapter 2 are minority attempts to fight back against a society which they feel has relegated them to permanent inferiority. Whether real or imagined, the undercurrent of racial division in America inhibits total assimilation by all people into the cultural and economic life of the nation. As much as Americans try to ignore, deny, or camouflage the issue--race plays a great part in American life.

A second great divisive issue in America, religion, threatens to separate people, not along doctrinal or denominational lines, but along the line which divides moral relativists from moral absolutists. Although religious and moral divisions present a complex set of variables, these two general camps emerge. Distinct issues such as abortion, homosexual rights, assisted suicide, school prayer, and the secular humanist agenda are hotly contested. A war is being waged over the cultural values of the nation, and the outcome will decide the future form of American society. The moral absolutists generally represent the traditional, conservative, Judeo-Christian values and European culture upon which the nation was founded. The moral relativists generally advocate a liberal, secular-humanist, multicultural position. To the antagonists, the issues are as clear as right and wrong; good and evil. Shades of gray do not exist for true believers. The possibility of a consensus of values, attitudes, and beliefs is fading away due to the virulent nature of the battle.

The third divisive issue is crime; more specifically the drug and ethnic gang problem which infects every major city in America. They not only pose a threat by their criminal actions, but also their very

existence undermines the values of society and the credibility of government authority. A nation with conflicting social or ethical values, such as the United States, experiences even greater disorder than one in which such values are clear and understood. The fact that the people of the United States hold no consensus of moral and religious values contributes to a social environment where drug abuse and criminal gangs flourish. No observer can avoid the obvious conclusion that gangs are also racially/ethnically oriented. Racial animosity and frustration with life give gang members a ready made, yet invalid, excuse for criminal conduct.

Having said that the United States has conflicts over race, religious values and beliefs, and cultural norms, as well as a serious crime problem, the "so what" test must be applied. These problems are not new to America, but by looking at their effects on other societies, Americans can get a picture of their future if remedies are not soon found. Americans, although we tend to think otherwise, are not immune or superior to the influences, emotions, faults, or characteristics which define social relations in other nations.

Some prominent writers have expressed their belief that race, ethnicity, religion, and cultural divisions will fuel the fires of future wars. According to them, the nation state as we know it will be pushed aside by non-traditional actors who will pursue insurgent warfare for the sake of cultural and ethnic hostility.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan writes in Pandaemonium about the demise of the former Soviet Union and the role that ethnic differences have played and continue to play in that region. He concurs with others that

ethnic and religious animosity will reemerge as the dominant force in warfare. He advances examples where this has been the case, such as Yugoslavia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, Croatia, Somalia, Rwanda, Burundi, and others. Although his book is geared toward international politics, he cautions that America is potentially subject to the same fate. "The current small-arms fighting in American cities is bound to escalate in terms of both weaponry and of aggression against whites; a role reversal, but the same drama."¹ To those who would argue that the U.S. doesn't have nearly so great a case of ethnic division, he states that, "Ethnic conflict does not require great differences; small will do."²

Martin Van Creveld writes in The Transformation of War of an upcoming era of "warfare between ethnic and religious groups."³ He states that "The rise of low intensity conflict may, unless it can be quickly contained, end up destroying the state."⁴ Van Creveld feels that the nation-state might slip into obscurity and be replaced by warmaking entities such as tribal societies, city states, mercenary bands, religious associations, or commercial organizations. He sees a future world order where racial tribalism and crude conflict dominate events. His view of future war is one of chaotic disorder contained by no geographic boundaries or inhibitions against the engagement of non-combatants. War will be waged by and against ethnic and religious groups across national boundaries. His analysis, though it addresses a world view, also speaks to possibilities for American society. He declares that, "The United States is another large, multi-racial society

where weapons are available and that has a tradition of internal violence second to none."⁵

Steven Metz, author of The Future of Insurgency, states that the failure of the cold war ideologies has exposed ethnic/tribal hostility as a primary source of conflict which was always present.⁶ He also states that violence is seen by some people as an uplifting experience which gives a feeling of cleansing to someone who has felt abused by a socio-political system.⁷ Given the racial differences in the U.S., the tradition of violence, and the availability of arms, it seems very reasonable to suggest that this society is vulnerable to internal conflict as experienced by other nations.

As discussed above, American culture clashes are not only racial in nature, but also religious. Samuel Huntington speaks of future trends in war in his article, "The Clash of Civilizations." In it he says that the "dominating source of conflict will be cultural."⁸ The clash between civilizations, according to Huntington, will center on their differences which are in, ". . . history, language, culture, tradition, and most important, religion."⁹ Religion discriminates more sharply among peoples than does race, and it gives people an extremely strong sense of cultural identity. The resurgence of religions is characterized by fundamentalist movements in Western Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, and Hinduism, as well as Islam.¹⁰ Cultural fault lines exist in Huntington's view which are replacing the ideological boundaries of the cold war. His model divides Europe physically between Western Christianity on one side and Orthodox Christianity and Islam on the other. Where these cultures physically meet violent conflict has

persisted, even though temporarily checked by the artificial unity of twentieth century ideology. He attributes the current bloodshed in the Balkans to these cultural fault lines.

A similar view suggests that the United States is developing, not geographic, cultural fault lines, but cultural lines of conflict based on strongly held religious and moral grounds. Violence already attends the abortion issue and is possibly a harbinger of much greater conflict and urban warfare like that presently seen along the fault line in the Balkan States. To many people the United States is religiously divided between the Christian/absolutists and Humanist/relativists. The potential for violent conflict among these antagonists grows stronger with time.

As discussed in chapter 3, criminal gangs in the United States often conflict with police forces and rival gangs. A form of warfare exists in the streets of America now. Van Crevald says:

. . . one day the crime that is rampant in the streets of New York and Washington D.C., may develop into low intensity conflict coalescing along racial, religious, social, and political lines, and run completely out of control.¹¹

Steven Metz discusses the concept of commercial insurgency which conforms to the drug gang situation in America. Metz's commercial insurgency arises when the discontented in society define personal meaning with an inordinate desire for wealth and possessions.¹² Gurr's idea of PRD comes to bear here especially when the urban poor experience media exposure to affluence which is beyond their capacity to acquire, and moral restraint on the means of acquisition are non-existent.

Narco-insurgency and terrorism seen in countries like Colombia and Peru are manifestations of commercial insurgency. In these cases

the narco-terrorists have become power brokers in the political system and directly challenge the sovereignty of the nations in which they operate. While the problem is not yet advanced to the same degree in the United States, further declines in the social order and underlying moral foundation will only contribute to the power of criminal gangs and their insurgent potential.

Internal Threat--Reality or Fantasy?

Chapter 3 of this study gave an overview of some of the hostile groups in American society. As shown they base their hostility on the issues of race, religion, and crime, as well as a general feeling of animosity toward the federal government.

Although no widespread or broadbased support for any of these groups is currently evident, they do possess a significant number of members. In some cases their membership goes into the tens of thousands such as with Posse Comitatus with 100,000 claimed members. Given the fact that they are very well armed, and assuming at least a modicum of competence, they potentially pose a very serious threat to social order.

It is also significant to note that their grievances conform to the future "dominant forces" in warfare--ethnicity and religion. These groups represent the tribalization of American society. Though not socially acceptable, they express the base instincts and fears of many people. Racism, religious animosity, cultural hatred and raw criminal greed find release among these groups. A distinct poverty of moral behavior accompanies their acts of violence, and in fact they thrive on conditions of moral decay and value confusion, both of which are evident in contemporary American society.

No direct threat to constituted government is currently posed by any of these groups. However, their future potential as catalysts for social disorder is great and can not be discounted. They periodically surface as a result of some localized act of violence, but mostly they lie fallow waiting for the tide of disorder to sweep over the nation.

Government Forces--Ready or Not?

In the face of violence and disorder, government forces must be prepared to respond to these new dangers. As seen in chapter 4, the government has tools to apply to fix the outbreak of violence. Available assets and public law are sufficient to deal with a range of threats be they internal conflict, insurgency, or warfare. Doctrinal corrections are needed in the areas of civil disturbance operations, MOUT, and domestic support operations, as discussed in chapter 4. Turning from a theoretical, or doctrinal, look to an historical one, three examples of government use of force against a hostile group reveals further weaknesses.

In May, 1974 six members of the Symbionese Liberation Army (SLA), a radical group with leftist, anti-American sentiments, were located in a Los Angeles residence.¹³ The group was prominent in the news at that time because of their kidnaping of Patty Hearst and the San Francisco bank robbery in which she took part.

In short order, the LAPD SWAT team, city policemen, county Sheriff's deputies, and FBI agents surrounded the house and demanded the surrender of the SLA members. In all, about 350 law enforcement officers were on hand for the confrontation.

A firefight ensued with over 1,000 rounds of ammunition being expended by police forces in the hour long exchange.¹⁴ The end result was the death of all six SLA members in the house without a single police casualty. This was certainly a favorable outcome for the police. However, the possibility of rescuing Patty Hearst, wrongly assumed to be a hostage inside the house, was negated by the direct assault.

Police forces were used as a blunt instrument rather than a precision team to rescue a hostage and kill or subdue her captors. The police surrounded the house, announced their presence, and demanded a surrender rather than conducting a surprise, forced entry, with selective firepower to overcome resistance. The chosen course of action burned the house to the ground and charred the remains of the dead, delaying identification and prolonging the mystery of Patty Hearst's whereabouts.

The second example is the May, 1985 incident in Philadelphia involving the black cult, MOVE.¹⁵ In this case a radical group was barricaded in a Philadelphia row house refusing to surrender to police. After failed negotiations, attempts were made to force entry into the house. High pressure water hoses were used in an effort to dislodge a rooftop bunker, and a cellar wall was unsuccessfully breached. Both attempts failed leaving police frustrated and desperate for a solution.

After a 90 minute firefight with no decisive results, an explosive device was dropped on the roof to gain entry. A fire ensued which quickly got out of control leaving 61 homes in ruins, 250 people homeless, and 11 MOVE members dead. As in the SLA example, a lack of shock, surprise, and precision characterized police action. A high

volume exchange of gunfire preceded a fire which finally proved decisive even though disastrous for the neighborhood.

The last example centers on the notorious Branch Davidian incident in Waco, Texas in April, 1993.¹⁶ Following a February shootout with agents from the BATF which left four agents dead, a 51 day siege of the Branch Davidian compound followed.

Frustrated by a lack of progress in negotiations, Janet Reno, the Attorney General, ordered a limited assault on the compound intending to "gas and negotiate" the surrender of the Branch Davidians. Military combat engineer vehicles were used to knock holes in the walls of the compound's buildings, and tear gas was pumped inside. This action was preceded by a telephone warning to the Branch Davidians by the FBI's lead negotiator. The buildings caught fire and 86 people died in the flames.

Criticism of the FBI action came quickly from many sources. According to Newsweek, members of the military's Delta Force were scornful of the plan. They stated that, ". . . it violated a cardinal rule of counterterrorism: once an assault has begun, entry teams must quickly subdue the targets before they have time to regroup."¹⁷ In this case, the assault began, walls were knocked down, but no assault was made. The initiative remained with the Branch Davidians.

In all three of the historical examples a lack of speed, shock, and precise execution characterized police action. Even though government forces have the assets to do the job, civilian law enforcement units might lack the training or skill to execute raids against well armed defenders. A successful raid is done with speed,

shock, violence of action, and minimal collateral damage. Police units succeeded in killing their opposition, but their actions were sloppy and inflicted excessive collateral damage. It remains to be seen if active military SRT's can do the job any better, but since they train for such contingencies on a full time basis it would be prudent to involve them in future incidents of this nature. Their involvement might range from advice, assistance, and training to full command control and execution of the mission. Assistance is currently authorized by law, and FM 19-15, Civil Disturbances, states that military SRT's can only be used if no civilian teams are available.¹⁸ The legal implications of this are not addressed by this study and remain a topic for further research.

Conclusions

This study has determined that some of the preconditions necessary for internal conflict, insurgency, or warfare are present in the United States. The major areas of contention are race/ethnicity, religion, political disaffection, and crime. While the United States continues to exercise a large degree of social cohesion despite its heterogeneous composition, there are indicators of discord which may lead to violence. A number of violent groups exist which would like to exploit and exacerbate social divisions. Currently they lack widespread public support and enough committed members who are willing to plunge into direct combat against government forces. A small degree of external support is noted in a few of the Black separatist groups, but none of any significance.

The probability of internal warfare, that level of conflict which mobilizes large segments of the population, is low at this time.

This study has not found any evidence of massive hostility or any organization capable of channeling the energy and resources required to pursue internal war. As cultural lines of conflict become more intense over time the probability of violence increases. This study judges that internal war is not likely to happen within the next twenty years or more.

The probability of increased internal conflict, (low level violence between groups), and insurgency, (organized subversion and armed conflict), however, is significant in the near term. The social problems of race, religion, and crime will not disappear anytime soon, and it appears that they will get much worse. Increased ethnic separatism, lack of social assimilation, continued conflict over moral values and religious issues, and an ever increasing drug trade with its attendant problems of violence, crime, and disorder will certainly result in violent confrontations. The form which they will take will likely be urban conflict and insurgency.

Increasing social tension will precipitate riots and conflict on a more frequent basis than has been experienced to date. As social order and commonly held values become less certain, racial minority groups and white supremacists will vent their frustrations more often through violent expression.

Some hostile groups within America represent the potential for insurgency. They are armed, organized, and aggravated. Though no absolute predictive method is assumed by this study, it is reasonable to expect that the United States will experience a drastically increased

level of violence and insurgent activity from these groups in the next ten years.

Doctrinal deficiencies noted by this study include the inadequacy of civil disturbance doctrine to address domestic insurgency, paramilitary threat forces, or urban warfare. Additionally, MOUT doctrine presents unrealistic force ratio scenarios and does not deal with domestic MOUT and its implied political considerations.

In addition to doctrinal review, the U.S. Military, active and reserve, must prepare to combat internal threat forces. Special emphasis should be placed on MOUT, civil disturbance, and authority of military commanders in domestic operations. Civilian law enforcement agencies, National Guard, and active military units are not prepared to deal with an insurgent threat. Their level of training and proficiency do not meet the standards required for the full range of force options. Active military forces should directly train and certify civilian SRT's in the skills required for hostage rescue, forced entry, and urban assault.

In sum, internal warfare is not a likely, near term event. Increased internal conflict will occur. Additionally, insurgent groups are likely to use violence to pursue limited political and social objectives. To adequately deal with these new threats, military doctrine requires some revision and an increased role for active military forces is recommended. Based upon the three examples given in chapter 5, direct training and certification of civilian SRT's by active military forces is warranted. Additionally, increased support in the form of advice, assistance, and planning merit consideration.

Endnotes

¹Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Pandaemonium. Ethnicity in International Politics (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 23.

²Ibid., 15.

³Martin Van Crevald, The Transformation of War (Toronto: The Free Press, 1991), ix.

⁴Ibid., 192.

⁵Ibid., 195-196.

⁶Steven Metz, The Future of Insurgency (Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 1993), 11.

⁷Ibid., 10.

⁸U.S. Army, Joint and Combined Environments (Ft. Leavenworth: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1994), 55.

⁹Ibid., 56.

¹⁰Ibid., 57.

¹¹Van Crevald, 196.

¹²Metz, 13.

¹³"Fiery End for Six of Patty's Captors," Time 103 (27 May 1974): 9-10.

¹⁴"The War For Patty," Newsweek 83 (27 May 1974):18-21.

¹⁵Mark Starr and Anne Underwood, "Did It Have To Happen," Newsweek 105 (27 May 1985): 22-26.

¹⁶Barbara Kantrowitz, Ginny Carroll, Peter Annin, Todd Barrett, Bob Cohn, and Melinda Liu, "Day of Judgment," Newsweek 121 (3 May 1993): 22-27.

¹⁷Melinda Beck, Bob Cohn, Douglas Waller, Peter Annin, Ginny Carroll, and Andrew Murr, "The Questions Live On," Newsweek 121 (3 May 1993): 28.

¹⁸U.S. Army, FM 19-15. Civil Disturbances (Washington: Department of the Army, 1985), 3-6.

APPENDIX A

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study draws upon the writings of contemporary social theorists, expositions on modern American society, and studies which describe the future of warfare. From these sources this study determines the conditions and characteristics of social stability, and the conditions which precede disorder and conflict. It further identifies any socially divisive conditions in American society which might lend themselves to internal conflict, insurgency, or warfare.

After examining the conditions necessary for social violence, this paper surveys groups in society which pose a potentially violent threat and which might violently oppose the U.S. government. Their motivations, behaviors, and capabilities are discussed with regard to their potential for future violent acts.

U.S. government enforcement assets, law, and military doctrine are addressed to determine their adequacy to deal with organized violence from domestic threat groups. The study looks at roles and missions of local, state, and national agencies with respect to domestic warfare. Recommendations are made if necessary to correct deficiencies.

By analyzing American social conditions, potential threat groups, the possible nature of future warfare, and government enforcement tools, conclusions are drawn regarding the potential for internal warfare, and the ability of government forces to subdue it. A

quick look at a few confrontations between threat groups and government forces is used to illustrate problems which impair efficient resolution of domestic violence. No absolute predictive model is advanced in this paper, but judgments based on past performance and present capabilities are used to assess future threats.

APPENDIX B

LITERATURE REVIEW

Several sources were particularly important in determining social conditions of cohesion and conflict. They were Arthur Schlesinger's The Disuniting of America, Russell Kirk's The Roots of American Disorder, and Jim Nelson Black's book, When Nations Die. Although not specifically cited, The Devaluing of America by William Bennett is relevant to the topic and should be perused by a student of social conflict. Additionally, Daniel Patrick Moynihan's work, Pandaemonium not only speaks to the role of ethnicity in international politics, but also it relates to the issue in domestic terms and helped to make parallels between the United States and other nations.

U.S. Terrorists Radicals Revolutionaries, by Ryan Quade Emerson provides an extensive look at violent groups in America. It, along with periodical literature, and research papers available in the Combined Arms Research Library (CARL) at Fort Leavenworth, provided ample documentation for the study. The CARL also contains the United States Codes and military doctrinal literature required for a study of this kind. U.S. Army Field Manual 100-19 Domestic Support Operations was particularly helpful not only for its relevance, but also for its extensive references.

Current news and television interview programs helped in acquiring information, making contact with subject groups, and obtaining

interview transcripts. Personal interviews with subject matter experts in the Los Angeles Police Department and the California Army National Guard were of great help. Since up to date publications on violent groups can not be found in libraries, periodical literature and newspapers filled the gap.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Anti Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. Hate Groups in America a Record of Bigotry and Violence. New York: ADL, 1988.
- Barton, David. The Myth of Separation. Aledo, TX: Wallbuilder Press, 1993.
- Bennett, William. The Devaluing of America. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992.
- Black, Jim Nelson, When Nations Die. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1994.
- Carrigan, Ana. The Palace of Justice. New York: Four Walls Eight Windows, 1993.
- Corcoran, James. Bitter Harvest. New York: Viking Press, 1990.
- Delk, James D. Fires and Furies. Sacramento: Balboa Books, 1994.
- Emerson, Ryan Quade. U.S. Terrorists Radicals Revolutionaries. Bethesda: Interests LTD., 1987.
- Gurr, Ted Robert. Why Men Rebel. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.
- Hacker, Andrew. Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal. New York: Ballantine Books, 1992.
- Kirk, Russell. The Roots of American Order. La Salle, IL: Open Court Publishing, 1974.
- Lockhart, William B., Yale Kamisar, and Jesse H. Choper. The American Constitution: Cases-Comments-Questions. ST. Paul: West Publishing, 1975.
- Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. Pandaemonium. Ethnicity in International Politics. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- New American Standard Bible. Iowa Falls: World Bible Publishers, 1975.
- Ridgeway, James. Blood in the Face. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 1991.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. The Disuniting of America. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992.

Smith, F. LaGard. Sodom's Second Coming. Eugene OR: Harvest House, 1993.

Weinstein, Allen, and R. Jackson Wilson. Freedom and Crisis. New York: Random House, 1978.

Zawodny, J. K. Nothing but Honour. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978.

Periodicals

"Activists: Death sentence won't stop anti-abortion violence."
Leavenworth Times. 7 December 1994, A-2.

Beck, Melinda, Bob Cohn, Douglas Waller, Peter Annin, Ginny Carroll, and Andrew Muir. "The Questions Live On." Newsweek, 3 May 1993, 28.

Delk, James D. "Military Assistance in Los Angeles." Military Review. September 1992.

Farley, Christopher, John. "Patriot Games." Time. 19 December 1994, 48-49.

"Fiery End for Six of Patty's Captors." Time. 27 May 1974, 9-10.

Kantrowitz, Barbara, Ginny Carroll, Peter Annin, Todd Barrett, Bob Cohn, and Melinda Liu. "Day of Judgment." Newsweek. 3 May 1993, 22-27.

Leber, Gary. "We Must Rescue Them." Hastings Center Report. November/December 1989, 26.

Kaplan, Robert D. "The Coming Anarchy." Atlantic Monthly. February 1994.

Kansas City Star. 11, 22 August; 17 October; 10, 13 November 1994.

Starr, Mark, and Anne Underwood. "Did It Have To Happen." Newsweek. 27 May 1985. 22-26.

"The War For Patty." Newsweek. 27 May 1974, 18-21.

Government Documents

Civil Disturbance Statutes. U.S. Code. Vol. 10, secs. 331-334 (1956).

Metz, Steven. The Future of Insurgency. Carlisle Barracks: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 1993.

- Military Cooperation with Civilian Law Enforcement Officials. U.S. Code.
Vol. 10, secs. 371-380 (1981).
- U.S. Army. AR 190-45 Military Police Law Enforcement Reporting.
Washington D.C.: Department of the Army, 1988.
- U.S. Army. AR 380-13 Acquisition and Storage of Information Concerning Non-Affiliated Persons and Organizations. Washington D.C.:
Department of the Army, 1974.
- U.S. Army. AR 381-10 U.S. Army Intelligence Activities. Washington,
D.C.: Department of the Army, 1984.
- U.S. Army. AR 500-50 Civil Disturbances. Washington, D.C.: Department of
the Army, 1972.
- U.S. Army. AR 500-51 Emergency Deployment of Army and Other Resources Support to Civilian Law Enforcement. Washington, D.C.: Department
of the Army, 1973.
- U.S. Army. FM 19-15 Civil Disturbances. Washington, D.C.: Department of
the Army, 1985.
- U.S. Army. FM 34-130 Intelligence Preparation of the Battlefield.
Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 1994.
- U.S. Army. FM 90-10 Military Operations in Urbanized Terrain (MOUT).
Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 1979.
- U.S. Army. FM 100-19 Domestic Support Operations. Washington, D.C.:
Department of the Army, 1993.
- U.S. Army. FM 100-20 Military Operations in Low Intensity Conflict.
Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 1990.
- U.S. Army. Operational Law Handbook. Charlottesville: The Judge Advocate
General School, 1994.
- U.S. Army. Subcourse 551/0 Low Intensity Conflict. FT. Leavenworth: U.S.
Army Command and General Staff College, 1989.
- U.S. Army. DOD Civil Disturbance Plan Garden Plot. Washington, D.C.:
Department of the Army, 1991.
- U.S. Department of Defense Directive 3025. 12. Employment of Military Resources in Event of Civil Disturbances. Washington, D.C.: GPO,
1971.
- U.S. Department of Defense Directive 5240. 1-R. Procedures Governing Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1982.

U.S. Department of Defense Directive 5525. 5. DOD Cooperation with Civilian Law Enforcement Officials. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1986.

U.S. Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, 1994.

The White House. A National Security Strategy Of Engagement And Enlargement. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1994.

Miscellaneous Sources

Cantrell, Alvin D. "Drugs and Terror: A Threat to U.S. National Security." An Individual Study Project, U.S. Army War College, 1992.

Denney, Mike, Captain, Arizona Department of Public Safety. Interview by Foreign Military Studies Office, 24 August 1994.

Hogg, David R. "A Military Campaign Against Gangs." Monograph, U.S. Army School of Advanced Military Studies, 1993.

Lochner, Keith, Assistant G-3, 40ID. Interview by author, 16 December, 1994.

Peterson, Steven W. "Civil Disturbance in The American Urban Environment." Master of Military Art and Science. Thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1993.

Revelle, Oliver. Interview by Ben Kinchlow on Christian Broadcast News, 23 November 1994.

Thompson, Linda D. America Under Siege. Produced by the American Justice Federation. Indianapolis, 1994.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Combined Arms Research Library
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-6900
2. Defense Technical Information Center
Cameron Station
Alexandria, VA 22314
3. Dr. Graham H. Turbiville
Foreign Military Studies Office
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027
4. LTC Geoffrey Demarest
Foreign Military Studies Office
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027
5. COL (R) William Mendel
Foreign Military Studies Office
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027
6. Chief, National Guard Bureau
Headquarters, Department of the Army, Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20310
7. Professor Steven Metz
Strategic Studies Institute
U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013
8. National Interagency Narcotics Institute
P.O. Box 8104
San Luis Obispo, CA 93402-8104
9. U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20531
10. Department of the Army
Headquarters, Forces Command
ATTN: J-5
Fort McPherson, GA 30330-6000

11. Department of the Army
Headquarters, Atlantic Command
ATTN: J-5
1562 Mitscher ave. Suite 200
Norfolk, VA 23551-2488

12. MAJ Dan Curtner
5363 Taney ave. #101
Alexandria, VA 22304

with class

CERTIFICATION FOR MMAS DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT

1. Certification Date: 05/02/95
2. Thesis Author: MAJ DAN CURTNER
3. Thesis Title: THE POTENTIAL FOR INTERNAL
WARFARE IN THE UNITED STATES

4. Thesis Committee Members
Signatures:
- Grah-Hi Tumbelle
Jeffery D
Wm W Mundy

5. Distribution Statement: See distribution statements A-X on reverse, then circle appropriate distribution statement letter code below:

(A) B C D E F X SEE EXPLANATION OF CODES ON REVERSE

If your thesis does not fit into any of the above categories or is classified, you must coordinate with the classified section at CARL.

6. Justification: Justification is required for any distribution other than described in Distribution Statement A. All or part of a thesis may justify distribution limitation. See limitation justification statements 1-10 on reverse, then list, below, the statement(s) that applies (apply) to your thesis and corresponding chapters/sections and pages. Follow sample format shown below:

S	-----SAMPLE-----			-----SAMPLE-----			-----SAMPLE-----			S		
A	<u>Limitation Justification Statement</u>			/	<u>Chapter/Section</u>			/	<u>Page(s)</u>			A
M												M
P	<u>Direct Military Support (10)</u>			/	<u>Chapter 3</u>			/	<u>12</u>			P
L	<u>Critical Technology (3)</u>			/	<u>Sect. 4</u>			/	<u>31</u>			L
E	<u>Administrative Operational Use (7)</u>			/	<u>Chapter 2</u>			/	<u>13-32</u>			E
	-----SAMPLE-----				-----SAMPLE-----				-----SAMPLE-----			

Fill in limitation justification for your thesis below:

<u>Limitation Justification Statement</u>	<u>Chapter/Section</u>	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>/</u>	<u>/</u>	<u>/</u>
<u>/</u>	<u>/</u>	<u>/</u>
<u>/</u>	<u>/</u>	<u>/</u>
<u>/</u>	<u>/</u>	<u>/</u>
<u>/</u>	<u>/</u>	<u>/</u>

7. MMAS Thesis Author's Signature: Dan Curtner

STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited. (Documents with this statement may be made available or sold to the general public and foreign nationals).

STATEMENT B: Distribution authorized to U.S. Government agencies only (insert reason and date ON REVERSE OF THIS FORM). Currently used reasons for imposing this statement include the following:

1. Foreign Government Information. Protection of foreign information.
2. Proprietary Information. Protection of proprietary information not owned by the U.S. Government.
3. Critical Technology. Protection and control of critical technology including technical data with potential military application.
4. Test and Evaluation. Protection of test and evaluation of commercial production or military hardware.
5. Contractor Performance Evaluation. Protection of information involving contractor performance evaluation.
6. Premature Dissemination. Protection of information involving systems or hardware from premature dissemination.
7. Administrative/Operational Use. Protection of information restricted to official use or for administrative or operational purposes.
8. Software Documentation. Protection of software documentation - release only in accordance with the provisions of DoD Instruction 7930.2.
9. Specific Authority. Protection of information required by a specific authority.
10. Direct Military Support. To protect export-controlled technical data of such military significance that release for purposes other than direct support of DoD-approved activities may jeopardize a U.S. military advantage.

STATEMENT C: Distribution authorized to U.S. Government agencies and their contractors: (REASON AND DATE). Currently most used reasons are 1, 3, 7, 8, and 9 above.

STATEMENT D: Distribution authorized to DoD and U.S. DoD contractors only; (REASON AND DATE). Currently most used reasons are 1, 3, 7, 8, and 9 above.

STATEMENT E: Distribution authorized to DoD only; (REASON AND DATE). Currently most used reasons are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10.

STATEMENT F: Further dissemination only as directed by (controlling DoD office and date), or higher DoD authority. Used when the DoD originator determines that information is subject to special dissemination limitation specified by paragraph 4-505, DoD 5200.1-R.

STATEMENT X: Distribution authorized to U.S. Government agencies and private individuals of enterprises eligible to obtain export-controlled technical data in accordance with DoD Directive 5230.25; (date). Controlling DoD office is (insert).